

THE  
AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW,  
AND  
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

---

---

VOL. XVII.

JULY, 1865.

No. 2.

---

---

THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN: DARWIN, HUXLEY AND LYELL.

- (1.) *The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection*, by CHARLES DARWIN, M. A. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860.
- (2.) *Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature*, by THOMAS H. HUXLEY. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1863.
- (3.) *The Geological Evidence of the Antiquity of Man, with remarks on Origin of Species by Variation*, by SIR CHARLES LYELL, F. R. S. Philadelphia: Geo. W. Childs. 1863.

THESE three works are very closely allied, not only by the doctrinal sympathies and intimate relations of their authors, but also by the close relationship of the subjects of which they treat, and the common object proposed.

Mr. Darwin attempts to show, that all animals now in existence have been derived from the lowest and simplest forms of life, by *transmutation* of species acting through illimitable periods of time.

Mr. Huxley adopts this doctrine of transmutation, and thinks that he has proved that Man is the nearly allied if not immediate descendant of the Gorilla.

Sir Charles Lyell accepts, with approbation, slightly modified, these views of his friends, and undertakes to furnish them, from the records of Geology, all the time demanded by their speculations.

We propose to briefly review each of the above works, with a view to determine how much of scientific truth and philosophy each is entitled to claim. Preparatory to this task, we desire to give expression to some thoughts in regard to the nature and distinction of Species,—as this is the main subject of the first two works we intend to review.

The question of Species—its origin, nature, and limits,—has always been a most vexed subject of dispute, upon which naturalists are now divided, and will probably always differ in their views. We may observe the facts connected with its phenomena, note its distinctions, and speculate on its nature, but the laws which govern its Origin and Extinction are beyond the reach of Philosophy. Its *causation*, if not revealed, must ever remain hidden in the mind of the Creator—for Science holds no clue to guide her groping steps. Where Science ends, Faith begins.

Prof. J. D. Dana, in an Article as profound as it is original, which appeared in the November No., for 1857, of the "American Journal of Science and Arts," has established, in a conclusive manner, the existence of species as "essentially realities in nature." Reasoning from the general to the special, he shews that the true *type idea*, or notion of species, is not to be found in any one group, but in the *potential element* which lies at the basis of the existence of each individual of the group. He demonstrates that, in accordance with the universal law which governs all existence, and which pervades all nature, this potential element must be a fixed and definite *unit*, capable of multiplication in the inorganic world, by combination of fixed equivalents, and in the organic world, by self-reproduction. Thus he proves that *permanency* is a necessary attribute of species, demanded by the harmony of the universal



law of existence ; and he also shews that *variation* from the normal type—whatever that may be—is demanded by the universal law of “mutual sympathy,” which determines all change of composition or decomposition, growth or decay. Hence he deduces, with great philosophical severity, the essential idea of a species, to be “a specific amount or condition of concentrated force, defined in the act or law of creation.”

This stringent formula is intended to embrace all the departments of nature ; but while it expresses, with severe accuracy, the logical type idea of species, as a real existence, it by no means, as Prof. Dana admits, gives us a conception of the material *type* form. Though species is a reality, no type idea of it can be represented in any one material existence, nor be designated by any one example. Nor can we ascend, by induction, from a study of the individuals, to a correct conception of the type of the species,—inasmuch as “the variables,” as well as “the constants,” form an element of the type, and therefore the conception formed from the study of the individuals, is a conception only of its phases or modifications. Nevertheless, we may adopt this stringent formula as a safeguard against specious generalizations.

In applying it to the animal kingdom, we may construe it as meaning,—that specific degree and kind of vital organization necessary for the development of the individual under modifying circumstances, and which is defined by the act or law of its creation.

The above formula defines species in relation to its *essence* ; but it is also desirable to consider it in relation to its manifestations of *form*, and to accompany the definition with some sure test, whereby to guide and correct our classification of individuals. Considered in this relation, we would define *Species* to be an original organized form, specific in its kind and immutable in its fundamental characteristics, but capable of developing varieties under modifying circumstances. The individuals of a species constantly reproduce their like with those of the same species ; but their offspring, by generation with any other species, is incapable of continuous fertility.

This definition recognizes a special law of being for each in-

dividual of a species, stamping immutability upon its generic *seminal* characteristics, in harmony with the general law of Nature, which determines, with mathematical precision, the component elements of all bodies and forces. But while it thus imposes constancy of fundamental characteristics on all, it allows to each individual great *variety* of development in accommodation to surrounding circumstances, and in obedience to that universal law of mutual sympathy and reciprocal action, which diversifies with change every department of Nature.

Could we ascertain with accuracy the fundamental seminal characteristics which distinguish one animal from another, we would be able to make our scientific classification of species accord with that distinction which really exists in nature. Our present classifications are, in no small degree, uncertain and arbitrary, based, frequently, on very slight differences of structure, form or color. Thus, for instance, "a slight peculiarity in the coloring of a minute part of the anterior wing" of a butterfly, (*Vanessa atalanta*,) is sufficient to create a doubt whether it should not be made the basis of a distinct species. So also the African, Indian and fossil Elephant, (*E. primigenius*,) are made distinct species in consequence of slight discrepancies of form in the markings on the wearing surfaces of their molars ; which, in the first, are *lozenge* shaped, and in the last two, rather more rhomboidal.

Appealing to our present classifications, it is not strange that the advocates of the so-called development theory should find, in Nature, some few facts which apparently support their visionary hypothesis of transmutation of one species into another. These pretended instances of transmutation may be more correctly attributed to individual peculiarities, perpetuated under favorable circumstances, being simply *varieties* developed under certain conditions, and which present an apparent constancy, so long as the modifying conditions which developed them remain constant. Look at the vast changes that man has wrought by art in many domestic animals, developing varieties, but never altering species. See the striking differences which separate the races of dogs, many of which occur

naturally, and, under given circumstances, are constant. We class the brown and black bear as different species,—yet what differences do they present at all comparable to those which distinguish the mastiff from the spaniel, or the greyhound from the bull-dog ; or these again from the scent-hounds. So also the varieties of domestic fowls present as marked differences as those which distinguish many individuals of the parrot or grouse family, which are classified as distinct species.

Until the time of Lamarck, the scientific world generally accepted the definition of Linnæus, that “a species consisted of individuals, all resembling each other, and re-producing their like by generation.” This definition, though vague, had the merit of fixing, by an infallible *test*, the line of distinction, but it did not recognize the law of change, by which *varieties* are developed from the influence of external causes. Lamarck, observing that some fossil “shells were so nearly allied to living species that it was difficult not to suspect that they had been connected by a common bond of descent,” proposed to add to the above definition of Linnæus the following clause, viz : “so long as the surrounding conditions do not undergo changes sufficient to cause their habits, characters and forms, to change.” This addition was very good, inasmuch as it recognized the universal law of change, by which varieties are developed in every department of Nature, within fixed limits. Had Linnæus inserted it in his definition, it would have constituted the basis of a true development theory, and would have precluded the origin of the present transmutation hypothesis.

Lamarck, ignoring Linnæus’ great test of distinction, and not duly appreciating Nature’s great law of change, fixed his attention exclusively on the *varieties* developed under this law ; and by an unwarrantable generalization of facts, carefully observed, he broached the startling doctrine of progressive transmutation of species, by which the origin of Man, God’s master-piece, has been derived from a monkey, through the successive evolutions of a primary monad. According to him, a short-legged bird, constantly desiring to catch fish to better advantage, gives rise to a race of long-legged waders.

In like manner, the camel-leopard has acquired its present shape, by constantly stretching out its neck to reach the higher branches of trees, as the lower ones became scarce. These fanciful lucubrations of Lamarck clearly indicate the origin of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis.

The anonymous author of the "Vestiges of Creation," which appeared in 1844, following closely in the tracks of Lamarck, introduced, as a principal element of change, the force of maternal volition, acting on the embryo, thereby transmuting it into a higher grade than its parent.

Mr. Darwin has somewhat modified these materialistic hypotheses, but it is doubtful whether he has much improved them. To get rid of the imputation, to which the others are liable, of making the orderly arrangement of nature the result of *blind chance*, he imagines the existence of some vague controlling power, called "Natural Selection," equally blind and materialistic, *operating solely through chance variations*. He also attempts to get rid of another objection to Lamarck's theory—which demands a continual creation of monads, by spontaneous generation, to supply the place of those which have been progressively advanced—by arguing that variation is not *necessarily* progressive, but that, in the struggle for existence, any animal, which has some slight advantage over his fellows, is "naturally selected" for transmutation into some other form, perhaps not superior in organization. This supposition, if true, involves no change of principle, but only a slight difference in the partial working of the machinery of development. The fundamental principle of both hypotheses is the same, viz :—that the Animal Creation has been progressively developed, from the lowest to the highest form, from a Monad to Man.

Mr. Darwin's scheme of creation is based entirely upon the following assumptions :—

1st. That "all the organic beings, extinct and recent, which have ever lived on this earth," are the modified descendants, by natural generation, of one common ancestor, and in this common descent, "all have been connected by the finest gradations." His argument for this assumption is an unwarrant-

able application of the maxim so often quoted by him, "*Natura non facit saltum.*"

2d. As all animals are apt to *vary*, and have a tendency to increase beyond the means of subsistence, he assumes that some advantageous chance variation in an individual, transmitted to its posterity, has enabled them to root out their fellows, in the struggle for food, and has led, "as a consequence, to Natural Selection," thus giving birth to new species, and causing "the extinction of less improved forms." His argument for this assumption is based on a perverse generalization of the well-known fact, that all animals are capable of developing *varieties*,—and he supports it mainly by citing the great diversity of form produced in pigeons, and other animals, by a careful and judicious selection.

3d. His greatest assumption—and a monstrous one it is—consists in making this "Natural Selection," which is the consequence of physical causes, the law-giving *cause* and controlling agent of creation, endowed with an all-wise and all-provident intelligence. He asserts that this "Power" has accumulated the slight accidental variations of individuals, from the beginning of time, preserving the good and rejecting the bad; that it has, with consummate wisdom, directed these chance variations into many distinct lines of development, thereby *creating* new animals with new organs; that it has adapted them to their proper localities and proper functions; endowed them with their necessary instincts; and distributed them into those distinct classes, orders, genera and species, which we now behold. The monstrous assumption that such an imaginary power exists in nature, being, at the same time, both the creature and the creator of physical law, is the pivot on which Mr. Darwin makes his hypothesis revolve, in order to meet any objection or to solve any difficulty.

On these three assumptions, Mr. Darwin founds what he calls his "theory," and against it we advance three objections.

1st. His "Natural Selection," considered as an intelligent Agent, is not a *vera causa*.

2d. His natural selection, considered as the consequence of physical law, is *incompetent* to produce the changes which he attributes to it.

3d. There is *another cause*, and a far more rational one, which accounts for the phenomena he seeks to explain.

These objections, which embrace the tests of a sound theory, will underlie all our remarks ; but the loose and desultory manner in which this book is written, abounding in repetitions and devoid of all sustained argument, forbids strict method in its review, and forces us, in some degree, to the necessity of like repetition.

We will now proceed to give some quotations, which will justify the accuracy of the above analysis, and will prove our author's theory to be, according to his own showing, merely a fanciful hypothesis.

He accounts for the origin of creation as follows :—

"I believe that animals have descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants, from an equal or less number.—Therefore I should infer, from analogy, that probably all the organic beings which have ever lived on the earth have descended from *some one primordial form*, into which life was first breathed." p. 420.

This creed demands from us more *Faith* than the cosmogony of Moses.

In his introductory remarks, he says :—

"As many more individuals are born than can possibly survive ; and as, consequently, there is a frequently recurring struggle for existence, it follows that any being, if it varies, however slightly, in any manner profitable to itself, under the complex and sometimes varying conditions of life, will have a better chance of surviving, and thus be *naturally selected*. From the strong principle of *inheritance*, any selected variety will tend to propagate its new and modified form." p. 12.

From this it is manifest that natural selection is made dependent upon "*chance*."

At the conclusion of his work, while contemplating the present aspect of nature as having "been produced by laws acting around us," he says :—

"These *laws*, taken in the largest sense, being Growth with Re-production ; Inheritance, which is almost implied by re-production ; Variability from the indirect and direct action of the external conditions of life, and from use or disuse ;\*—a Ratio of Increase so high as to

\* As an example of the modifying influence of "use and disuse," we give our author's method of accounting for the fact, that cows have no upper incisors.

lead to a Struggle for Life, and, as a consequence, to Natural Selection, entailing divergence of character and the extinction of less improved forms. Thus, from the war of nature, from famine and death, the most exalted object we are capable of conceiving, namely, the *production* (creation?) of the higher animals, directly follows." p. 425.

(The capitals are the author's, but the italics here and elsewhere are generally our own.)

From this it would appear that our author makes growth, variability, and a high ratio of increase,—all of which are results of external causes,—to be *creative laws*; and that "Natural Selection" is a consequence of one of these laws, viz., a high "Ratio of Increase."

The term, "Natural Selection," upon which his whole scheme turns, is used very loosely by our author. At one time it expresses the beneficial effects of cross-breeding; at another time it signifies the adaptability of animals or plants to certain conditions and localities; and then again, it refers to sexual preference. In regard to this *sexual* natural selection, we will cite a single passage, more as a specimen of the kind of analogical reasoning with which the book is filled, than as a sample of the author's peculiar views of the production of new forms, by the "charms of the males."

"The rock-thrush of Guiana, birds of Paradise, and some others, congregate; and successive males display their gorgeous plumage, and perform strange antics before the females, which, standing by as spectators, at last choose the most attractive partner.—If *man* can, in a short time, give elegant carriage and beauty to his bantams, according to his standard of beauty, I can see no good reason to doubt that *female birds*, by selecting, during thousands of generations, the most melodious or beautiful males, according to their standard of beauty, might produce a marked effect."

But the idea of "Natural Selection," which characterizes our author's hypothesis, is, that of an omnipotent, beneficial,

---

"The calf, for instance, has inherited teeth, which never cut through the gums of the upper jaw, from an early progenitor, having well developed teeth; and, we may believe, (credat Judeus,) that the teeth in the mature animal were reduced, during successive generations, by *disuse*, (!) or by the tongue and palate having been fitted, by *natural selection*, (!!) to browse without their aid." He adds, that Nature has thus taken pains to reveal "her scheme of modification, which, it seems, we wilfully will not understand." We imagine that very few will wish to excuse themselves from the charge of wilful disbelief in such visionary schemes.



discriminating "Power," which accomplishes all the changes, and explains all the mysteries of Creation. We will proceed to give some quotations, to prove how distinctly our author invests this power with the attributes of a controlling, intelligent Creator, constantly at work.

"It may be said that natural selection is daily and hourly *scrutinizing*, throughout the world, every variation, even the slightest; rejecting that which is bad, preserving and adding up all that is good."—p. 80.

"If then we have, under nature, variability, and a powerful agent, *always ready to act and select*, why should we doubt that variations in any way useful to beings under their excessively complex relations of life, would be preserved, accumulated, and inherited?—What limit can we put to this power, acting during long ages, and *rigidly scrutinizing* the whole constitution, structure, and habits of each creature, favoring the good and rejecting the bad? I can see no limit to this power," &c.—p. 407.

"If it profit a plant to have its seeds more and more widely disseminated by the wind, I can see no greater difficulty in this being effected through *natural selection*, than in the *cotton planter* increasing and improving by selection the down in the pods on his cotton trees."—p. 82.

"Natural Selection *acts*, as we have seen, exclusively by the preservation and accumulation of variations which are *beneficial*," &c.—p. 117.

"If it were no advantage (to an earth worm to be highly organized) these forms *would be left* by natural selection unimproved, or but little improved; and might remain for indefinite ages in their little advanced condition."—p. 119.

"If, under changed conditions of life, a structure before useful becomes less useful, any diminution, however slight, will be *seized on* by natural selection; for it will profit the individual not to have its nutriment wasted in building up an useless structure."—p. 134.

"And as long as the same part has to perform diversified work, we can see why it should remain variable; that is, why natural selection should have *preserved or rejected* each little deviation of form less *carefully*, than when the part has to serve for one special purpose alone."—p. 135.

These few quotations aptly illustrate the sophistical as well as illogical reasoning which our author employs throughout his book. He first assumes the existence of a purely imaginary cause, to which he arbitrarily ascribes, as occasion requires, the attributes of omniscience and omnipotence, and *then* he "can see no great difficulty" in imputing to its sole agency all the diverse phenomena of Nature. This sophistry the more grievously offends, by being constantly palmed off on us as a logical

argument, in proof of his visionary and oft-times absurd speculations.

But we have selected these passages to prove that the author clearly asserts Natural Selection to be, not only an all-powerful, intelligent, and discriminating Agent, but that its power and intelligence is exerted exclusively for the benefit of the individual. In fact, our author says, plainly :—

“Natural Selection will never produce in a being anything injurious to itself, for Natural Selection acts solely by and for the good of each.”—p. 179.

Yet, on the same page he says,—“But Natural Selection can and does often produce structures for the direct injury of other species.” This last remark is made to explain the existence of poison fangs in the adder and the rattlesnake. But here our author finds himself in a hobble. The sting of the wasp and bee, owing to the backward serratures, cannot be withdrawn, and therefore cannot be used by the insect without causing its inevitable death. He attempts to obviate this objection, by the remark, that “Natural Selection will not produce absolute perfection.” But still, aware that the above fact gives the lie to his oft-repeated fundamental principle,—that Natural Selection never produces an organ for the injury of its possessor,—he tries to reconcile it by concluding that this sacrifice of the individual is made *pro bono publico*! “For,” he says, “if, on the whole, the power of stinging be useful to the community, it will fulfil all the requirements of Natural Selection, though it may cause the death of some few members.” This easy requirement, however, does not comport with what he says on the next page, in regard to the “inexorable principle of Natural Selection.”

We now proceed to give a crowning instance of this imaginative author's fanciful scheme of creation, by the agency of Natural Selection.

On page 169, he says :—

“If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.”

But he can find no such case,—and therefore gives us his

*recipe* for making an "eye," which we commend to the reader's special attention. It is as follows :—

"It is scarcely possible to avoid comparing the eye to a telescope.—If we must compare the eye to an optical instrument, we ought, in imagination, to take a thick layer of transparent tissue, with a nerve sensitive to light beneath, and then suppose every part of this layer to be continually changing in density, so as to separate into layers of different densities and thicknesses, placed at different distances from each other, and with the surfaces of each layer slowly changing in form. Further, we must suppose that there is *a power always intently watching* each slight accidental alteration in the transparent layers; and *carefully selecting* each alteration which, under varied circumstances, may in any way, or in any degree, tend to produce a distincter image. We must suppose each new state of the instrument to be multiplied by the million; and each to be preserved till a better be produced, and *then the old ones to be destroyed*. In living bodies, *variation* will cause the slight alterations; *generation* will multiply them almost infinitely, and *natural selection* will *pick out with unerring skill* each improvement."

He remarks, in this connection, on page 168 :—

"I can see no very great difficulty, (not more than in the case of other structures) in believing that Natural Selection has converted the simple apparatus of an optic nerve, coated with pigment and invested by transparent membrane, into an optical instrument, as perfect as is possessed by any member of the great Articulate class."

In the next sentence he says :—

"He who will go thus far, ought not to hesitate to go further, and to admit, that a structure even as perfect as the eye of an eagle might be formed by Natural Selection, although in this case he does not know any of the transitional grades."

And then adds, with sublime coolness :—"His reason ought to conquer his imagination." !

Upon the strength of *such reasoning*, he requires the reader to admit that "there is no logical impossibility in the acquirement of any conceivable degree of perfection, through Natural Selection."

Every reader of Mr. Darwin's book must be struck with one peculiarity, which characterizes his mode of argumentation, or manner of handling his subject,—for it can hardly be called reasoning, even by courtesy. It consists in the use of the term, "Natural Selection," in connection with such expressions as, "I can see no difficulty,"—"It is conceivable,"—"We may

suppose," or "I have no doubt,"—occurring on almost every page, and constantly advanced in explanation of all the mysteries of nature, without the slightest regard to logical sequence.

Thus the difficulties of a question are stated and re-stated with many facts, opinions, and much irrelevant matter, and then the most astounding conclusion is drawn from a very frivolous premiss, or the most sweeping generalization is based on a flimsy foundation, which, coupled with the above stereotyped expression, is offered as a full and logical solution of the whole difficulty. We will give but two instances, out of a host.

The constant re-production, in every community of bees and ants, of working *neuters*, presenting a fixed structure different from their parents, is a mystery which is fatal to his hypothesis; for this peremptorily demands that the acquisition and perpetuation of any given form, shall be the effect of direct inheritance. His hypothesis, therefore, will not apply to those forms the possessors of which are sterile. "But," says Mr. Darwin, "some insects, in a state of nature, *occasionally* become sterile;" this is his premiss,—and the conclusion which he immediately draws from it is this:—

"And if such insects had been social, and (if) it had been profitable to the community that a number should have been annually born, capable of work, but incapable of procreation, *I can see no very great difficulty in this being effected by Natural Selection.*"—p. 209.

Nor can any one else, *if* "Natural Selection" have the same power as God Almighty.

Again,—he learns from Mr. Hearne, that a black bear was seen swimming, for hours, with widely open mouth,—probably overheated by running, and cooling himself. His assumption is, that he was "thus catching, like a whale, insects" in the water." His generalization of this odd freak of a bear, and its *supposed* motive, is, that black bears may become the progenitors of a whale-like progeny. He says:—

"Even in so extreme a case as this, if the supply of insects were constant, and if better adapted competitors did not already exist in the country, *I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by Natural Selection, more and more aquatic in their structure and*

habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced *as monstrous as a whale*."—p. 165.

Mr. Darwin's own inability to see any difficulty in nature which his Natural Selection cannot remove, is always his strongest argument to induce others to accept his hypothesis.

The examples, as well as the reasoning, by which he seeks to inculcate his doctrine, in the way of illustration, insinuation, or indirect support, are extremely lame and impotent, not to say frivolous. Thus, for instance, from the fact that a wood-pecker has been occasionally seen feeding on fruit, or catching insects in the air or on the ground, he would have us to conclude that this bird was not originally formed to climb trees and bore for insects, but that this faculty was conferred on it by Natural Selection. In proof, he tells us that he had once seen a bird which he *considered to be a wood-pecker*, [mark the evidence,] inasmuch as it looked and flew very much like a wood-pecker, but "which never climbs a tree," [mark the proof,] for he met with it "on the plains of La Plata, where not a tree grows."—p. 165. Thus he cites the frigate-bird, as being web-footed, yet never alighting on the water, [a mistake,] and also the grebe and coot, which are eminently aquatic, "although their toes are only bordered by membrane,"—as proof that these birds are being transmuted, by Natural Selection, into different species. He says, "In the frigate-bird, the *deeply* scooped membrane between the toes *shows* that the structure has begun to change." In like manner, he would have us come to the same logical conclusion of transmutation by Natural Selection, *because* "there are upland geese, with webbed feet, which rarely or never go near the water,"—and because, petrels, the most aerial of birds, and water-ouzzels, which belong to the thrush family, dive and swim, (as he asserts,) like auks or grebes.

So also the existence of rudimentary front teeth in calves is advanced as convincing proof that some ancient cow, who had lost her front teeth, or who had laid them aside by "dis-use," finding that she could get along better with tongue and palate, was the progenitrix of all cattle which have no upper front teeth. In like manner, from the rudimentary teeth

of foetal whales, he insinuates their *terrestrial* origin—probably from *bears*, as before stated. So also, as the tail is an organ of motion in fishes, he argues that Natural Selection has modified the shape, but preserved the same use in terrestrial animals of *aquatic* origin; thus in dogs, (he says,) the tail enables them to turn quicker, though he admits that the hare, with hardly any tail, turns readily enough.

Mr. Darwin's book is not a work of scientifically applied facts in proof of a theory, but is, principally, a diffuse and very illogical argument, based on a misapplication of known facts, by which he seeks, first, to support his gratuitous assumptions, and then, by a fanciful not to say absurd application of his assumptions to more obscure facts, he attempts, at the same time, to establish his hypothesis, and also to claim for it the merit of explaining these obscurities.

Giving free scope to a lively imagination, inherited, doubtless, from his grand-father, the celebrated author of the "*Loves of the Plants*," Mr. Darwin has generalized from his assumptions, and has thus devised an hypothesis, which makes men and brutes all but self-existent, since they are self-created from simple monads, upwards.

Thoroughly, and we doubt not, honestly convinced of its truth, he asserts its competency to explain all the mysteries of creation more satisfactorily than any other theory, and he can see no difficulty, under its illumination, in accounting for the most obscure phenomena of nature. It is, however, in regard to the origin and extinction of those ancient forms of life which Geology discloses, that Mr. Darwin claims for his hypothesis special merit. He thinks he has at length solved this difficult problem. Let us carefully test this claim.

Geology teaches, with great distinctness, the successive changes which have modified the surface of the earth—from that state in which no trace of organization can be discovered, up to its present condition, teeming with varied forms of life. It also records the successive appearance of different forms of organized beings, advancing in the scale of creation, from the simplest cellular plants and plant-like animals, entombed in the deepest rocks of the earth, to man, whose origin cannot be

traced beyond the dust and "drift" which cover its present surface. It also reveals the fact that each race, as it came into existence, was admirably adapted to the physical condition of the earth at the time of its appearance, to the place it was designed to fill, and the functions it was called upon to discharge.

This is the catholic creed of Geologists, whether they believe in Revelation or not. Preparation, plan, and nice adaptation, mark every stage of the world's progress. "Nor is it only the PLAN of the great types, (to use the words of Agassiz,) which must have been adopted from the beginning, but also the *manner* in which these plans were to be executed ; the systems of form under which these structures were to be clothed, and even the ultimate details of structure which, in different genera, bear definite relations to those of other genera ; the mode of differentiation of species, and the nature of their relations to the surrounding media, must likewise have been determined,—for the character of the classes is as well defined as that of the four great branches of the animal kingdom, or that of the families, the genera, and the species." He also expresses the conviction, "*that the whole creation is the expression of a thought, and not the product of physical agents.*"

The four great types referred to above, present characteristic structural differences, which were as fixed and determinate in the earliest animals which Geology reveals, as they are in those of the present day.

By adding to these great types the lowest form of animal life, we have five great divisions of the Animal Kingdom, under which every animal that has ever lived may be ranked, and which may be specified, beginning at the lowest, as, I. Protozoans ; II. Radiates ; III. Molluscs ; IV. Articulates, and V. Vertebrates.

How many and which genera or species, comprised in each of these great divisions, were original and independent creations, what developments or modifications from external causes these primordial genera or species have undergone, will probably, as we have before said, always be a matter of doubt and dispute.



While Geology discloses in each of these great divisions gradational forms adapted to their surroundings, it also discloses the co-existence of three of these distinct types, in the earliest periods of time, and consequently forbids the idea of their progressive transmutation from one to the other. It establishes the fact of separate and independent creations, each with its distinct gradational forms,—and thus concurs with Divine Revelation, as well as with scientific observation and human experience, in condemning the visionary speculations of Mr. Darwin.

In what way these distinct primordial forms first came into existence, science is absolutely incompetent to determine, for the line of inquiry is beyond her reach. If the great Author of nature has given us no revelation of His creative acts, which faith can receive, we must necessarily be content to remain in humble ignorance.

Mr. Darwin, however, is of an entirely different opinion. He thinks he can explain how physical laws and physical agents have brought into existence all the successive forms of organic life, from its first beginning, and how they have, with discriminating wisdom, adapted them to the progressive modifications of the earth's surface, determined their mutual relations, as parts of a whole system, and decreed the functions which each was to perform in the drama of life.

He is, indeed, forced to admit the necessity of some supernatural agency, (he does not say what it was,) in order to account for the vitality of at least "*one primordial form into which life was first breathed.*" This being done, all necessity ceases for further intervention on the part of the implied Deity, and the whole *plan* of creation, as subsequently realized, so wise, so beautiful, so wondrously harmonious, is the result of the chance operations of physical agents, under the watchful and beneficent providence of Natural Selection!

In order to test the scientific and philosophic merit of this hypothesis, let us make a rigid application of it to the known facts of the Animal Kingdom.

As the fundamental idea of this hypothesis is the transmutation of animals from simpler to higher forms, by Nat-

ural Selection, "accumulating slight successive favorable variations," it is evident that the primordial forms of Mr. Darwin must have belonged to the lowest great division of the Animal Kingdom, viz., to the Protozoans.

Thanks to the labors of Prof. Ehrenberg, of Berlin, and others, this sub-kingdom, hitherto little known, has been very thoroughly explored. In one class, (infusoria,) which Ehrenberg has named Polygastria, he has described twenty-two families, of which the Monadida is the first and simplest, each containing many species. This class "exists, in countless millions, in water, both salt and fresh ;"—"many of these living atoms crowd the water in which they are found to such an extent, that they are not separated from each other by a space greater than the size of their whole bodies ; so that, by a very little calculation, it will be seen that one drop of such water contains more of these active existences than there are human beings on the surface of the globe." Their universal distribution, where water is to be met with fit for their reception, is another marvelous fact connected with these animals.

Mr. Darwin could not desire better conditions for the test of his hypothesis. Here we have all his so-called *laws*, in vigorous operation ; "Growth, with Re-production ;" "Variability ;" and especially his main law, "a Ratio of Increase so high as to lead to a Struggle for Life, and, as a consequence, to Natural Selection, entailing Divergence of character, and the Extinction of less improved forms." We are ready to admit, that in this state of things, at an early day, some one or more monads, pressed by hunger, may by *chance* have developed "a Variation ;" possibly, some superiority in their prehensible proboscis, which is their only external organ, and serves for progression and nutrition. We agree that this would give them a very great advantage over their fellows, and that they would "have a better *chance* of surviving, and thus be *naturally selected*" to become—better fed monads.

This variation of form, thus acquired, would doubtless be transmitted to their offspring, without the aid of our author's inevitable Natural Selection,—for these animals have no sexual preferences, but perpetuate themselves by self-division.

Nor is there here any chance for "Natural Selection (to act) by accumulating slight successive favorable variations;" for, granting at the start, the greatest possible variation which the simple structure of these animals will admit of, consisting of a stomach and proboscis, the only result that could follow would be, a race of better fed and better developed Monads. The utmost development of any *variation* in the form of these organs, would not *transmute* them into new and different organs; and we have demonstration that it has worked no "Divergence" in the essential characteristics, nor produced any "Extinction" of this simplest aboriginal family.

So also one or more of the voracious family of the Amœba, who are ever changing their shapes by the protrusion and retraction of the foot-like processes of their bodies, might, by some accidental variation or increase of this faculty, have been able to feed more abundantly on other animalculæ. Such variations, transmitted to their descendants, may have produced that diversity in size and shape which we now observe; nevertheless, the characteristics of the family remain unaltered.

These are instances of the lowest forms of animal life,—mere animated globules, or living ventricular sacs, corresponding to the cellular amphygams of the Vegetable Kingdom. According to the hypothesis of Mr. Darwin, they, or their vegetable analogues, must have furnished the "one primordial form," from which, he thinks, "all the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth, have descended,"—for, there are none lower, to be developed into higher forms of life, by *Natural Selection*. What "Divergence of character and extinction of less favored forms" has Natural Selection accomplished, during the millions of ages which are claimed for organic life? These first progenitors of animated nature, according to a strictly consistent interpretation of this hypothesis, ought to have gone to their graves long ago,—having been pushed out of existence in the struggle of life, by far higher and more favored forms,—for it is upon this principle that Mr. Darwin accounts for the extinction of those ancient races which Geology reveals. But the fact is, these *forefathers* still live and flourish; they have undergone no extinction or divergence of

character, for they remain, still, the lowest and simplest possible form of organization, and their prodigious numbers are still as great as they possibly could have been, when a primal sea deposited in the Cambrian strata the first token of organic life.

Such is the starting point to which Mr. Darwin has confined himself, by his own terms ; and according to his direct statements, this is the beginning and end of the Divine agency in the work of creation. He tells us, plainly, that every other animal has been manufactured, by Natural Selection, out of the *inherited chance variations* of probably one primordial form,—the bad ones being rejected, and the good ones accumulated and “worked up” into different types of organization, by this ever-vigilant power. According to him, God created only a *monad*, but Natural Selection has transmuted it into a reasoning *man*, and has breathed into him a conscious immortal soul !

Such is the monstrous and absurd conclusion in which his hypothesis ends. In support of it, he appeals in vain to Geology, to prove that the extinct forms of ancient life, were the gradual developments of one parent stock. Geology refuses to reveal that infinite succession of slightly differing gradational forms which his hypothesis demands,—but, on the contrary, denies the assumption, by disclosing Protozoans, Radiates, Molluscs, and Articulates,—all co-existent from the earliest time. Mr. Darwin is conscious of this, and, accordingly, *laments* the imperfection of the geological record, but *hopes* that the time will come when it will be more in accordance with his hypothesis. He would have had less cause for grief, if he had framed his hypothesis in accordance with facts, instead of seeking, by gratuitous assumptions, to explain facts, to which he afterwards appeals in vain to prove his hypothesis.

He invokes the aid of time to prove, that these assumed transmutations of structural type, of which no trace can be found in the lowest of the zoic rocks in which fossils occur, were produced imperceptibly, by infinitely small degrees, during the illimitable periods of geological eras, which he claims for the azoic rocks, in which no trace of life has ever been discovered. But time, without specific force, (which he has failed

to demonstrate,) is powerless to effect change. An eternity of time could never quicken into motion the *vis inertie* of unorganized matter, so as to create new organizations,—nor could it change, in the slightest degree, the laws imposed on organized beings, from their first origin.

In framing his fanciful scheme, had he taken for his starting point, the original creation of one or more primordial forms in each of the great and distinct divisions of the Animal Kingdom, from which to develop his variations, he would have met with far less opposition from the geological record.

He might then have argued with far more plausibility from the development of variations, and from the modification of external causes, that the ancient extinct forms of each division had been gradually supplanted by kindred representatives now living. Passing over, in silence, the four lower sub-kingdoms, and confining himself solely to the highest, or Vertebrate, he would have found full necessity for the most extensive periods of time, and full scope for the most unbridled imagination, in applying these causes, simply, to the gradual development of homologous parts, so as to account, by the accumulation of slight beneficial changes, for the transmutation of the gills, scales and fins of a fish, into the lungs, feathers and wings of a bird, equipped with beak and claws.

We say that such a supposition would have been more plausible, though it would still be irreconcilable with geological facts and sound philosophy. But the admission that several or all the great types of organization were distinct creations, would entirely defeat the scope and aim of our author's hypothesis, which is, manifestly, framed so as to make the nearest approach to spontaneous generation, and to exclude a Divine Creator, as far as it is possible, from the works of creation.

Having breathed life into a globular monad, there is no farther need for His creative agency, or orderly arrangement. Mr. Darwin's imagination can "dream the rest;" thenceforth Natural Selection takes the place of Divine intelligence.

We think it is evident, that Mr. Darwin has sought, from the very start, to invent an hypothesis which should be in direct opposition to what he calls "the common theory of sep-

arate and independent creations,"—meaning thereby the Mosaic theory. He is constantly challenging this theory, as incompetent to explain those mysteries of life which he thinks are so clearly elucidated by his own fanciful speculations. Aristotle attributes distinct creations to the "*mens divina*,"—Plato, to the "*anima mundi*,"—and Harvey, a wiser physicist than either, to "the Creator and Father of all things in heaven and earth ;" but Mr. Darwin charges with folly or wilful blindness, all who cannot see that Natural Selection exercises all the attributes of a Divine Creator. Notwithstanding this arrogant assumption of superior wisdom, had he fairly and scientifically generalized from the facts which he has confusedly heaped into a visionary hypothesis, he would have more rationally deduced the theory, that all animals were originally divided into fixed classes, according to great structural types, as Science attests. He would have recognized, that in each of these divisions, life had been breathed into a certain number of primordial forms,—we know not how many,—and that each of these primordial forms, whose "seed was in itself," was endowed with an inherent capability of variation,—to what extent we know not,—but such as would enable the race to conform to surrounding conditions, and to the progressive changes of the earth's surface.

Such a theory would be in accordance with Natural Science, and it would also be in accordance with the Mosaic record of creation, which claims to be a direct Revelation from its Divine Author. Such a claim, however, would not be admitted by the author of the "*Origin of Species by Natural Selection*." It would require too much *Faith* on the part of a scientific physicist, who studiously avoids all recognition of the agency of a Divine Creator, but who, nevertheless, with singular inconsistency, invests physical agents with the attributes of a provident Divinity.

To show how much faith our author demands from us,—his own cosmical Genesis, if thrown into an equally compendious form as that of Moses, would necessarily be as follows, according to his own statements. "In the beginning there was, probably, 'some one primordial form, into which life was first

breathed,' for all 'animals have descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or less number.' These progenitors, who were simple vegetable cells, or animal monads, have produced, by natural generation, each after his kind, whose seed is in itself, all the grass, herbs and trees on the face of the earth; also, all the creatures that move in the waters, or which fly in the air; also all the creeping things, beast and cattle of the field; also all the men that inhabit the earth. All these were generated by, 'probably,' only one monad, who developed 'variations' according to a law styled '*Variability*,' and transmitted them to successive generations of lineal descendants, in virtue of a law styled '*Inheritance*,' which is implied by the law of '*Growth, with Reproduction*.'—Thus were created all the diverse complicated structures of the Radiates, Molluscs, Articulates, and Vertebrates, which now inhabit earth, air and water.—Moreover, as each new animal came, successively, into existence by '*chance*' variations, his appropriate place was allotted him, his proper functions assigned, and his due and orderly relations to other animals prescribed by '*Natural Selection*,' which is a consequence of the 'frequently recurring struggle for existence' arising from the fact of 'many more individuals being born than can possibly survive.'"

We assert that the above is a truthful expression of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, given, as nearly as possible, in his own language, but divested of its verbiage and sophistry. The bare statement of its requirements shows, that it is equally opposed to analogy, scientific observation, human experience, and common sense.

He demands from Naturalists FAITH to believe in opposition to Science and sound Philosophy, that the four great types according to which all animals above Protozoans have constantly and uniformly been constructed, from the dawn of creation, are simply inherited variations in the forms of primordial monads. He requires them to believe that the orderly arrangement, by which all animals according to each distinct type, have been distributed into distinct natural classes of genera and species, manifesting the affinities of their peculiar types in an endless



variety of structural resemblances, yet always separated by fixed genetic differences, and that the skillful contrivance by which each of these distinct types has been modified in the construction of each species of animals, fitting them to inhabit land, water and air,—are accidental results. Also, that the consummate wisdom, manifested in the co-adaptation and the correlation of their diverse functions, establishing the mutual interdependency of all, in connection with individual antagonisms, thus binding all into one harmonious system, evincing the forethought of a plan, is fortuitous. We are modestly asked to believe, that all this order, contrivance and wisdom, is merely the result of slight chance variations of the lowest form of Protozoans, accumulated and systematically arranged by some incomprehensible and undefinable *thing*—a sort of physico-divinity—a chimera of Mr. Darwin's imagination, which has no place either in Science or Nature—dubbed "Natural Selection."

There is not a single fact to support his foundation principle of transmutation by Natural Selection, nor a particle of evidence to countenance a belief in the intelligent agency, or even in the possible existence of such a Power; and therefore the whole gigantic superstructure, built on this *phantasm*, stands, like an inverted pyramid, based on an ideal *non-entity*.

Surely, Mr. Darwin counts too much upon our credulity, as well as upon our ignorance of the secrets of Nature, when he asks us to accept such an hypothesis, as a substitute for the common theory of separate and independent creations,—or else he has sadly blundered in the use of his terms. The effects which he attributes to "variation" are distinct *creations*—and the agency of an intelligent, Divine Creator, is mystified under the name of "Natural Selection."

The reader will doubtless desire to know upon what facts so astounding an hypothesis is based. We answer, mainly upon some observations of pigeons, made by the author, who is at pains to inform us that he has "associated with several eminent fanciers, and have [has] been permitted to join two London Pigeon Clubs." These observations, and certain facts obtained from gardeners, cattle-breeders, and others, in regard to the great and beneficial changes effected by a *judicious selec-*

tion of parents for cross-breeding, thereby originating new *varieties* of the same species, and the facts derived from some naturalists in regard to the blending of species and varieties in our classifications—constitute the only ground for his doctrine of the origin of species by Natural Selection. Numerous other facts cited by our author, sometimes to support his assumptions, and sometimes to be fancifully explained by them, are all susceptible of a much more philosophical application than he makes of them, and are not properly relevant to his hypothesis.

The fact that all his numerous breeds of pigeons, manifesting every variety of form and color, were well ascertained descendants of the blue rock pigeon, gives good ground for the belief, that many plants and animals, presenting less marked physical differences, though *classed* as distinct species, are also descendants from a common parent. This furnishes a strong argument against the endless multiplication of species, with which our present systems of classification are burthened,—but it is no evidence in favor of transmutation.

So also his facts and reasoning in regard to the numerous races of dogs ; the stripes and bars on horses ; hybridity of plants and animals ; the change of form and habits produced under domestication, by skillful selection, or occurring naturally ; the modification of some races and the extinction of others ;—and much other matter which he misapplies, might be aptly cited to show that our knowledge of the conditions essential to the *perpetuation* of varieties, and of the *limits* to which their development may be carried, is still very imperfect. These facts would go far to prove that many reputed *species*, living and extinct, are simply *varieties* of one or more primordial species, but they furnish no proof whatever, that the duration and successive phases of development, of each primordial form were not pre-determined and immutably fixed by the law of its creation.

The analogies drawn from embryology and homology, in support of transmutation, are utterly fallacious. The affinities of structure and development, are no proofs of successive derivation ; they only illustrate the infinite contrivance of the Crea-

tor, Who, from a few elements, has constructed an endless variety of forms and functions. A mechanic, in building a boat, a carriage, a balloon, or a house, may and does use the same materials, and constructs each upon the same principles of art, and he may, if he choose, give to them all a similarity of external form ; yet each of these structures is a distinct creation, designed for a different element, and a different purpose, which cannot be transmuted by any kind of selection, without doing violence to the design of the builder.

Mr. Darwin devotes a considerable portion of his book to a labored and able attempt to prove, by facts and reasoning, that each species has migrated from a common center or "area," and has thus been distributed over the face of the globe. The establishment of this fact is necessary for those who maintain the common theory of the separate and independent creation of man and animals, which Mr. Darwin is combating. But we confess that we cannot see how it is relevant to an hypothesis which can consistently claim any necessary multiplication of centres or areas. In fact, this claim is an essential feature of his scheme. Why should not his ever vigilant Natural Selection act as efficiently in one part of the world as another ? The waters that wash the shores of every island, would furnish an abundance of "primordial forms," out of which Natural Selection could manufacture those species which were the best adapted for the locality, without the necessity of their emigrating from a distant area. Saving of time can be no object, for Mr. Darwin can justly claim that his friend Lyell has furnished him with illimitable periods of duration, for the most recent formation of the earth.

In conclusion, we would remark, that the philosophical aspect of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, is as objectionable as the scientific. A fallacious kind of argumentation characterizes all his reasoning. He confounds varieties with genetic differences of species, and then, by a false analogy, drawn from the great changes in animals of the *same* species, resulting from a skillful selection, made by the human reason, he accounts for *difference* in species, by referring it to a natural selection, dependent on appetite and other causes, external and accidental. Man,

guided by reason,—a gift which allies him to his Creator,—can *sub-create*, so to speak, and modify, within certain limits, the form and qualities of a dog, an ox, or a pigeon, by a judicious selection of parents, but he cannot make the slightest approach towards transmuting one of these animals into the other,—as is conclusively proved by the sterility of hybrids. They present specific genetic differences, imposed by the Author of creation, which man cannot alter or disturb. Is it not, then, the height of philosophic absurdity to appeal to this selection of the human reason, in proof of the assumption, that an unintelligent natural selection, operating through a blind “chance,” can transmute a bear into a whale, even though our author can see no great difficulty, as he says, in such an operation?

Another radical vice in Mr. Darwin’s philosophy consists in confounding, or rather confusing, the gradual, constant, and steady progress of life, from the simplest to the highest forms, in each of its *fixed* great typical divisions,—a gradational progress taught with equal clearness by Geology and Revelation,—with *transmutational* advances from one type to another, by “intermediate gradational forms,” of which there is not a particle of evidence, either in existing nature, or in the records of Geology.

But the ineradicable fallacy which vitiates his whole scheme, and converts it into an incredible philosophical romance, consists in making the order, harmony and unity of design, which is so plainly stamped on the plan of creation, to depend on some blind, accidental concatenation of physical causes, occurring in the struggle for life among animals, and resulting in the consequent production of an *intelligent* and *beneficent* power, which *creates* all the forms of life, scrutinizes and controls all the phenomena of nature, and upon which the discoverer has conferred the name of “Natural Selection.” It would be just as philosophical, and also just as intelligible, to say, that the Natural Selection consequent upon the motion of individual comets, has determined the orbits and relations of the heavenly bodies, as to assert, with Mr. Darwin, that the Natural Selection consequent upon the struggle for existence among individual animals, has exercised all the attributes of a provident Deity, in regulating the order of the Animal Kingdom.

We think we have said enough to shew the utter worthlessness of this transmutation doctrine, in a scientific and philosophical point of view. We have refrained from saying anything of its bearing on Revelation. We do not think it wise to attack with the sword of God's Word the honest infidelity of scientific men, who may be earnestly seeking to advance what they consider scientific truth, however much it may militate against our own views of Revelation,—provided always that no intended issue is sought by them.

Secure in the panoply furnished by the Holy Scriptures, we hold ourselves ever ready to give a reason for our faith in them, and to defend them from all attacks. We ask no odds against honest scientific infidelity, but are willing to meet it fairly on its own ground, confident, that although truth may sometimes appear to disagree with itself, yet it can never contradict or destroy itself,—and that it must ultimately triumph over error. We have no fears for the safety of the Bible. It is, saith Sir Thomas Browne, “too hard for the teeth of time; it cannot perish but in the general flames, when all things shall confess their ashes.”

The internal evidence of its Divine origin is set forth by Dryden, in an unanswerable argument.

“Whence but from Heaven could men unskilled in arts,  
In several ages born, in several parts  
Weave such agreeing truths? or how or why  
Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie?  
Unasked their pains, ungrateful their advice,  
Starving, their gain, and martyrdom their price.”

Nevertheless, we know that the faith of some unstable souls and weak minds, has been shaken by the incredible assumptions of this visionary hypothesis. Mr. Darwin seems to be aware of this fact, and meets the objection with his usual stereotyped argument of *inability to see it*. He says, in his Supplement, “I see no good reason why the views given in this volume should shock the religious feelings of any one;” and then adds, with great self-complacency, “It is satisfactory, as showing how transient such impressions are, to remember that the greatest discovery ever made, namely, the law of gravity,

was attacked by Leibnitz, 'as subversive of natural, and, inferentially, of revealed religion.' "

It is charitable to suppose, that "an overweening confidence in the principle of Natural Selection," which Mr. Darwin admits he is chargeable with, has so obfuscated his mental vision, that he cannot see the inconsistencies and true drift of his own hypothesis. He cannot see why it should shock the religious feelings of any one ! The reason is very obvious to others, if not to him. If this hypothesis be true, then is the Bible "*an unbearable fiction*," fabricated during successive ages, under an incomprehensible system of preconcerted imposture, yet interwoven with, and supported by, the history of many nations ; attested by stupendous frauds, which, nevertheless, defy the severest scrutiny ; promulgated with perfect consistency by many generations of disinterested impostors, who manifest, in their lives and writings, the sublimest morality. If this hypothesis be true, then also have Christians, for nearly two thousand years, been duped by a monstrous lie,—which, nevertheless, has consoled them in every exigency of life, and supported them in the hour of death ; and which has, by its own intrinsic power, elevated and civilized all mankind.

The issue is a very plain one. The Bible is a self-agreeing system of pretended truth, which deals with every man as a distinct, immortal, spiritual being ; while the hypothesis of Mr. Darwin, in shocking opposition, denies or ignores the very existence of the human soul, on which this system is founded.

This feature of it furnishes us with our last and strongest argument against his absurd scheme of creation. We will not, however, attack him with any weapon drawn from the arsenal of God's Word, but will meet him upon his own ground.

We premise,—and this must be well noted,—that Mr. Darwin is restricted, by his own terms, to the simplest form of life, as the starting point of creation. Unless, then, his primordial monad was also endowed with the principle of a human soul, when life was first breathed into it, it is evident that it could not transmit one to its descendants,—for there could not, possibly, be any chance variations of a principle which *did not exist*,—for Natural Selection to accumulate and develop.



Therefore, the soul does not exist in man, if it did not exist in his ancestral monad.

But that moral sense which enables us to perceive our relations to right and wrong,—that capability of abstract conception of truth and justice,—that consciousness of accountability as responsible agents,—that principle of veneration or religious sentiment,—all of which define the human soul as a distinct existence separate from the body, the mind, and the so-called *moral affections* of men and animals,—is “*the most intense of all realities*,” and is inseparably connected with the consciousness of our own existence.

It follows, then, if Mr. Darwin is conscious that he has a soul, he must either claim, in consistency with his hypothesis, that he has inherited it from his ancestral monad, or else, denying this, he must admit that Man came into existence by a subsequent creative fiat, when, by the breath of God he became a living Soul.

This admission would explode his whole hypothesis ; but there is no escape from the alternative, unless Mr. Darwin should take refuge in the grossest materialism, and maintain that the human soul is a property of matter, developed by organization.

We will conclude, by summing up, in a few brief words, what we have attempted to prove in the foregoing pages, viz : that Mr. Darwin's scheme cannot stand the three great tests of a sound hypothesis.

1st. His “*Natural Selection*,” dependent on chance, yet endowed with the attributes of a beneficent, discriminating creative agent, is not a *vera causa*, for there is no such thing in nature. It is purely an assumption and chimera of Mr. Darwin's imagination.

2d. The true unintelligent natural selection, which is dependent on physical law and external conditions, is *incompetent* to produce the phenomena he seeks to explain by his hypothesis.

3d. There is a *known cause* which is competent to produce these phenomena, and which is the only *vera causa* that can explain them, namely, an intelligent DIVINE CREATOR.

(To be continued.)



## ART. II.—AMERICAN POETRY, OLD AND NEW.

*The Columbiad*, by JOEL BARLOW. Philadelphia: Fry & Hamerer. 1807.

*The Poetical Works of Fitz-Greene Halleck*. New Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1865.

It is not much more than fifty years, since an eminent English critic,—we forget whether it was Brougham or Sydney Smith,—asked, contemptuously, “who reads an American book?” The question has not been often repeated, and the most corrugated Briton would scarce venture to propound it now. But, at that time, it was certainly both a wicked and unwise one. It could only tend to awaken envious and malicious feelings between two nations of close kindred, and had, doubtless, no small influence in embittering the brief War which followed. At that time, we, Americans, could scarce be said to have any separate Literature. We had not learned,—for as yet there had been neither space nor occasion,—to divide the writers of England from our own. We considered Bacon and Shakespeare and Milton as much our countrymen, as if they had been born on the banks of the Hudson or the Potomac; and had lived altogether in the eighteenth century. It was but short space before, that our principal Journalists had been born Englishmen; and two of them, Cheatham, in New York, and Dennie, in Philadelphia, were still living. The State papers and polished Essays, produced by the men of the Revolution, whether we consider force of argument or grace of style, compared advantageously with the best writers on the other side of the Atlantic. And we had vindicated, successfully in arms, the rights of which they had written the manifestos. Under such circumstances, and at such a time, to throw contumely upon successful effort, setting the snakes to bite Hercules in his cradle, was an unworthy office, especially when performed by one of our own kindred. It was seething the kid in its mother’s milk; killing us by means of one of our kindliest

affections. For, assuredly, in those times, and for long after, the weakest part in the American character was an unmeasured fondness and veneration for the language, laws and customs of the Mother country.

The offensive remark of the English critic, to which we have alluded, was, as we remember it, intended to apply only to the Poetry and artistic and professional literature of the day; and in so far, though ill-natured and unreasonable enough, might, under other circumstances, have been overlooked and forgiven. It was made before the age of Irving and Halleck and Bryant; when all we had to admire was the "Columbiad," and the "Conquest of Canaan;" two productions which our own critics have recently vilified more effectually than any Englishman would have ever cared to do.\* In the angry recrimination and bickering which followed the ill-timed taunt, its limitation was lost sight of, and bitter rejoinders were made, as if the whole body of American writers had been grossly slandered. In truth, the fault of the criticism was its lack of generality; for, with few exceptions, it applied as well to the light literature of England as to ours. And, had we waited but a few years, the authority of the greatest poet of the day would have settled this point for us. Lord Byron, in his "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," after belaboring soundly nearly the whole fraternity of his poetical contemporaries, condescends to acknowledge only four of them as brethren. This censure was, undoubtedly, prejudiced and severe, yet not altogether unreasonable or undeserved. The literary fervor which had arisen in England in the days of Dryden, Addison and Pope, had long since expended itself, and lost force by diffusion and over-growth. A class of minor poets had followed in the wake of these high-priests of the Nine, who are scarce remembered now. They were writers of verses, and good verses too, accurately measured, well sounding, well imitated, and on sensible subjects. But the remark is an old one, that civilization and refinement are not favorable to the inspiration necessary for great poets. The wonder has been that Milton, master as he

---

\* *Atlantic Monthly* for February; Article,—'Connecticut Pleiades.'

was of so many languages, and possessed of so much knowledge, should, with so many fetters about him, have been able to write so simply and majestically as he did. The poets of whom we have spoken, who wrote Essays, Translations, Plays, Odes, and Elegies, between 1760 and 1805, are not the divinities worshipped by Englishmen now, and will soon be merged and lost in an immense brotherhood like themselves. There is no hazard in saying, that the light literature of both countries, written in the interval we have mentioned, that is to say, between the times of Shenstone and Sir Walter Scott, as expressed in small books and Magazines, would be found now, by any unbiassed critic, to be very much of the same order and kidney. The great splendor of English Poetry had grown wan, and lost much of its original freshness, some years before we were recognized as one of the independent nations of the earth. It may not be amiss or unprofitable to review some of its previous history.

A language can hardly be said to belong to any country in particular, until it has become the medium of all official, as well as ordinary intercourse, and is used by the courtier as well as the peasant. In this technical sense, we can scarce fix the exact time when English became our English. For, from the *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari* of the barons at Runnymede, down to the *Defensio pro populo Anglicano* of Milton, all the Acts of State, and much of the political and polemical discussions of the time, had been conducted in Latin. It is true, the Holy Scriptures had been translated into English, in the interim, and perhaps that epoch, or the end of Elizabeth's reign, may be appropriately taken as the beginning of the English, which we have now. But, however this point may be settled, we think there can be no doubt that about the end of the last century, the language had assumed its most certain and stable structure, and remained stationary for a longer period then, than it had ever done before, or perhaps ever will do again. From the time of the Norman Conquest, up to that of Shakespeare and Bacon, it had been in a state of progression and change, increasing its volume by derivations from Latin and Norman French, and changing its orthography and pro-

nunciation, sometimes in conformity with one of these languages, and sometimes with the other.

Nor must we omit noticing another important feature which belonged to this period, and continued even later, or to the time of Pope and his contemporaries, which is; that thus far the study of Letters had been confined exclusively to the clergy, the nobility and gentry of the kingdom. It was for them only that books were written, and authors were supposed to address themselves always to intellects that had been subjected to some sort of preliminary culture. Even the political and polemical writing, in which the age between the reigns of Elizabeth and Anne had been so prolific, was directed solely to the learned. The common people understood only enough of it to keep what was technical in the right place, and apply epithets and distinctions to the right parties. But, between the end of the Civil Wars and the accession of William, the purpose and aim of men of letters underwent a most important and thorough change. In the long and bitter controversies about abstract principles of religion and government, which had arisen in England, as in other countries, out of the usurpations of the crown and the clergy, the voice of the people—held by the ancients with at least as much conceit as wisdom, to be the voice of God,—grew altogether too loud and powerful to be disregarded. In consequence, authors began to look for patrons as much among the lower as the upper ranks of society, and to write for the amusement, as well as the instruction of common people. Much of the disputation which had, hitherto, been carried on in the Latin tongue, or sanctioned by quotations from Roman authors, was now put forth in down-right English. While, for the recreation of the more unlearned, there then first appeared light and taking Essays, like those which are still preserved in the pages of the "Spectator," the "Tatler," and the "Guardian," and which, though not much read now, were then almost necessities at an English breakfast table.

As a very palpable consequence of this diversion of the purposes of literary men, the English Novel also appeared about this time, no longer twisted into Euphuism, or holding the lan-

guage of knight-errantry and romance, but delineating, in plain English, the habits, manners and peculiarities, of the living men and women of the time. From the same cause, namely, a desire, on the part of wits and scholars, to minister to the literary appetites of the common people, the Metropolitan theatres found themselves, about this time, overstocked with new Plays, which the play-goers then attended, holding in their hands little English librettos of the piece to be presented, as we now do at the Italian Opera. These Plays, especially the Tragedies, were all constructed by the card : that is, critically, and by rule. There was always a supremely piteous incident, which dominated throughout the piece, became the sole engrossing subject of attention, and left no room for any healthful delineation of nature, gleam of wit, or humorous conceit, by which the terrible misery of the stage business could be lightened or alleviated. Of this kind are the Tragedies of *Venice Preserved* ; the *Orphan* ; the *Fair Penitent* ; the *Fatal Marriage* ; and *Jane Shore*. To the last of which is prefaced the curious and almost unbelievable announcement, that it had been written in imitation of the historical plays of William Shakespeare !

The Comedies of that time were far more natural. The English had never quite forgotten the flavor of 'rare old Ben,' and although many peices of this class are by far too much over-strained to have any claim to the immortality even of a century, yet some others will always remain favorites with an English public. And whatever might be the artistic merits of the new pieces, they were in aim and purpose meritorious and commerdable, when compared with the vile ministrations which, but a short time before, had been offered at the same shrine by Dryden, Wycherley and Congreve. These last had been panders to the vices of a libertine Court, and a debauched and heartless nobility, and were now supplanted by an order of writers, who wrote for the people, felt their responsibilities, and addressed themselves to reprove vice and promote virtue.

One great result of what may be called the popularization of Letters, which occurred between the Civil Wars and the accession of the Prince of Orange, was undoubtedly the fixed-

ness and certainty of the language. While writing had continued a rare accomplishment, and its uses been confined to the learned and educated, both words and their construction remained, necessarily, plastic and changeable, and yielded readily to the mould in which noted and able authors cast them. The power which associations of learned men can exercise over a language, when in their exclusive keeping, may be inferred from the fact, that when the Liturgy of our Church was first put into English, Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, insisted, and the proposition does not seem to have been accounted altogether unreasonable, that the rounded and many voweled terminations of the original should be added to its English equivalents, in the translation. When, however, to write had become a more common acquirement, and extended to the commons as well as the nobility, both the vocabulary and the idiom of the language became comparatively stable, as if waiting for the public mind to overtake and sanction its value.

The literary excitement which grew up in England about this time, and which culminated in the reign of Queen Anne, was in a great measure due to this rather sudden assumption, by the common people, of critical functions and privileges to which they had hitherto aspired. Letters became, all at once, a taste, a fashion, and a trade. The Poet's corner of the Monthlies and other periodicals, which already began to give evidence of the germination which has since become so prolific, was filled, not only by collegians, students and clerks, but men of the town and men of the gown. Bishops and Generals; Lords and serving-men; tradesmen and apprentices; noble women and country dames; all began to have epidemic visitations of the *furor scribendi*, and gave vent to their inspirations. This originated a school of Poets, which may be called the Critical School; beginning with Cowley, Dryden, and Pope, and ending with Thomas Campbell; who, with two very elaborate productions, and some very tame and empty ones, has left us what is worth them all,—three of the best Lyrics in the language. The roll of intermediates in the procession of Poets of this school, Thomson, Wharton, Young, Shenstone, Gray, Cowper, Akenside, Collins, and many others, is a



very long one. Their productions are principally Translations, Plays, moral and didactic Essays, Odes, Epigrams, and Elegies, the coinage of the brain being all cast in small pieces, as if meant for circulation, rather than investment. In this, the age of Anne contrasts strangely with that of Elizabeth. Among the relics which have descended to us from the Queen last mentioned, the light pieces and sonnets, such as may have charmed Southampton or Raleigh, or amused the Queen and her ladies, are now scarcely read and little quoted, while the Plays live in a perpetual remembrance. From the later period, all that has come to us is light, in comparison with the other, differing as much from it in weight and quality, as the symposia, at which Camden or Burleigh may be supposed to have assisted, would differ from the merrier revels at the Mermaid, or St. James coffee-house. But, never before or since, had the business of authorship been in such high repute, or a knowledge of literature been so positively recognized as a true measure of ability among men, as in the reign of Anne.

At this time, when the intestine troubles of the English nation had nearly ceased, and its resources were rapidly developing themselves on every hand, the increased production of books and periodicals became a most important feature of the national character, and the literature thus created would have a natural tendency to run into imitated and fashionable forms. When every one wrote, it was necessary to write about everything. Hence, over-labored Odes, Elegies and Sonnets grew to be the prevailing taste. We had lines addressed 'to a sparrow's nest,' 'to a sky-lark,' 'to a kitten playing with falling leaves,' or to any other image whose impression happened to be strong enough to pass for inspiration. The field of the Muses was indeed cultivated, but the crop consisted, oftener, of Lavender than of Bays. Poetry was all written after the same pattern. The impersonations of the old Mythology were in constant requisition, and real mortals were compelled to wear the vizards of Phoebus or Mercury, Venus or Minerva, Bacchus or Cupid; and instead of tenantry the hills and dales of merry old England, they wandered in foreign countries, over Ida or Olympus, or by Ilissus and Helicon. 'Cas-



talia's feeble fountain murmured still,' but there were no life bubbles mantling on the basin into which it fell. It is matter of record, that Warren Hastings, in his retirement at Daylesford, had an Ode sent in every morning, with the eggs and rolls for breakfast. And Major Andre is said to have been in a poetic reverie, when his captors fell upon him at Tarrytown. Rhyming was a general predicament of good society,—an undisputable mark of gentility. We remember to have seen, somewhere in print, a translation of the '*otium divos rogat*,'\* written during the French War of 1760, by Captain Thomas Morris, of the British Army, then at Ticonderoga, and addressed to Captain (afterwards General) Richard Montgomery, then at Fort Stanwix; an irrefragable evidence of the great prevalence of the rhyming fever. We can only remember the following verses.

Ease is the prayer of him, who in a whale-boat  
Crossing Lake Champlain 's by a storm o'ertaken,  
Not his blanket struck: Not a friendly hamlet  
Near to receive him.

Ease is the wish too of the sly Canadian;  
Ease the delight of bloody Caghawager;  
Ease, Richard, ease not to be bought with wampum;  
Or paper money:

\* \* \* \* \*

Death instantaneous hurried off Achilles,—  
Age far extended wore away Tithonus.  
Who will live longest, you or I, Montgomery?  
Dicky or Tommy?

It must be very evident, from all this, that the poetry of that day, (about the end of the last century,) was not of the kind destined to be immortal. It was made critically by the pattern, but what it gained in finish it lost in power; and the same character, with few exceptions, applied to all the English poetry of the time, whether written in Britain or America. The great masters of the lyre, upon whom Englishmen prided themselves, had now long been dead, and their works were as

---

\* Hor. Lib. II., Car. 16., ad Grosphum.

much our property as that of their countrymen. Their immediate successors, so far, had been rather imitators and manufacturers, than inventors and artists. Song and melody had lost the spell of genius, and dwindled into a monotonous and unmeaning jangle. The critical school of Poetry had performed its function, become common and fashionable, and had now lain for many years in useless fallow, waiting for a new germinal impulse to renew its increase. This power came, as we think, in Scott's first ballad-minstrelsy, followed by those charming songs which shall endear his memory. He neglected alike the heroic measure, which Pope had made so popular, and the overwrought and over-laden varieties of the Ode, which we had borrowed from the ancients, and brought us back to the more musical and more English verse of an earlier time. The themes also were new, and the scenery all on British ground. With these he refreshed and cheered the over-jaded imaginations of the songsters of that day, led them into a new Parnassus among the lochs and mountains of his native country, and, for a while at least, put Apollo into a kilt, and threw a tartan plaid over the Muses. For it was not on the reading public alone, that this minstrelsy took effect, but also upon those who were critics and authors themselves. Campbell, whose fame was then near its zenith, acknowledged, with amazement, that in his walks about the city, he found himself unconsciously repeating lines from Cadyon Castle or the Grey Brother; and he soon after gave us *Gertrude of Wyoming*. About the same time, Moore left off his amatory effusions, and ventured upon *Lalla Rookh*; while Wordsworth, gathering up his forces, presented us, in the *Excursion*, with a wealth of true poetry, which might otherwise have meandered itself away in some hundreds of impromptus and sonnets. There was a perceptible renovation in the furniture of Pegasus, and the Muse was new-winged, and shod for a fresh journey.

Now, it was at this very time, or in the interval between decay and renovation, that the English critic, whose affairs at home were nearly in as bad a plight as ours, took upon himself to use us so despitely. At that time, with the exception of Akenside, Campbell and Rogers, who may be called the pleas-

ure poets, and the very titles of whose principal pieces betray a dearth among them of the inventive faculty, the rest of the poetry written in England, by bards of the old school, had neither more spice nor better flavor than the produce here. We might add some other exceptions, as for instance, Montgomery, and Henry Kirke White, but their whole number would bear little proportion to the legion of other recognized rhymesters. A fitter estimate of the character of the current literature of the two countries, might be made by comparing the magazine and periodical writing of them both. But, unfortunately for this purpose, it is difficult to procure materials. Copies of the *Port Folio* and *American Magazine*, the two principal American publications of that time, can now only be found in the Astor Library, and a few other similar institutions; while, to reach their English contemporaries, would require advertisement and reward. From such comparison we must, of course, exempt the *Edinburgh Review*, whose blue covers had just taken flight, at the time we speak of. For it was in one of them that the censure against our national literature made its first appearance. As we cannot, therefore, pursue this course, let us adopt Barlow's *Columbiad*, as a representative specimen of American heroics, and endeavor to say something in favor of its pretensions; or at least to wipe out stains which have been unjustly cast upon it.

We confess we would have liked this poem much better, had it retained the title and bulk of the *Vision of Columbus*, as it was first written, without having been spun out to the very unreasonable length of seven thousand lines. It might have thus gone safely down the tide of time, in company with the poem on *Hasty Pudding*, by the same author, as well-intended and very passable eulogiums on institutions which were peculiarly American. They would have been good collaterals, and added strength to each other's claims. As it is, the weight and mass of the latter production has very much impaired the buoyancy of both. The *Columbiad* also contains some philological blemishes, quite unnecessary, and which have a spice of affectation and conceit about them, which is not agreeable. To call a Yankee a Colon, and to use such

murderous adjectives as homiciduous, is quite inexcusable. But these defects apart, the versification is good, sufficiently Popish and musical, and written, in all things, according to the Epical canons and recognized fashion of the day. A very considerable merit of the poem, so far as criticism is concerned, is the impossibility of making selections. We may take the two following samples as perfect specimens of the whole :—

“From Mohawk’s mouth, far westing with the sun  
Through all the midlands recent channels run,  
Tap the redundant lakes, the broad hills brave,  
And Hudson marry with Missouri’s wave.  
From dim Superior, whose uncounted sails  
Shade his full seas and bosom all his gales ;  
New paths unfolding, seek Makenzie’s tide,  
And towns and empires rise along their side !  
Slave’s chrystal highways all his north adorn,  
Like corruscations from the Boreal morn.  
Proud Mississippi tamed and taught his road  
Flings forth irriguous from his generous flood  
Ten thousand watery glades ; that round him curled  
Vein the broad bosom of the Western world.”—Book x.

These prophecies of physical improvement have been more than fulfilled on our northern continent already ; but, alas, the picture of moral supremacy, which should have accompanied them, remains yet only a vision :—

“Think not the love of gold shall here annoy,  
Enslave the nation and its nerve destroy.  
No useless mine these northern hills enclose,  
No ruby ripens and no diamond glows.  
But richer stores and rocks of useful mold  
Repay in wealth the penury of gold.  
Freedom’s unconquered race with healthy toil  
Shall lop the grove and warm the furrowed soil.  
From rugged ridges break the rugged ore  
And plant with men the man-ennobling shore. <sup>15</sup>  
Sails, villas, towns and temples round them heave,  
Shine o’er the realms and light the distant wave.  
Nor think the native tribes shall rue the day  
That leads our heroes o’er the watery way.  
A cause like theirs no mean device can mar  
Nor bigot rage nor sacerdotal war.  
From eastern tyrants driven, resolved and brave,  
To build new states or find a distant grave.  
Our sons shall try a new colonial plan,  
To tame the soil, but spare their fellow-man.”—Book iv.

These two extracts are very fair specimens of the versification of the poem, and they compare very well, in construction, with other English heroics of the same day. They are not less musical and well divided, than those of Falconer and Darwin, which latter they somewhat resemble. But if, from the mechanical execution of the verses, we turn to the design of the poem, the fault is but too apparent, and must, in some measure, have been due to the unnatural enlargement which it underwent second-handed. The writer has attempted to give us the history of the civilization of a whole continent, and the muster roll of three armies, with a detail of their movements, in the same book, and this without selecting any one cardinal point of interest, about which the narration might be made to turn. The fields of Ilion and Latium, with slight diversity of sea, plain, mountain and river, held all the embattled hosts of Homer and Virgil, while our enterprising countryman was scarce content with the Thirteen States and a great part of Canada, and operated his armies from Quebec to Charleston, turning Apollo into a gazetteer. Such a scope of intention, no human skill or genius could properly fill up, nor the result be other than a long and listless story. When, however, our poetical annals shall have become fuller than they are now, the Columbiad will serve as a good point of reference, from which we may see our early condition, entitled to respect, more for its antiquity than its merit, the American fag-end of a critical and imitated school of English poetry, which can never be in vogue again. We should not be ashamed of it now, but treat it kindly, and criticise it with forbearance. It may hereafter hold the same relation to the poetry of palmier times, which the Prognostics of Aratus do to the Georgics of Virgil. No one now would think of putting these into comparison with each other, without due consideration of the different times in which they had been written.

The increased vigor and animation which had arisen among the bards and critics of England, soon after the publication of Scott's first metrical Romances, came by degrees across the Atlantic, and was felt among us. Indistinct harpings began to be heard, every now and then, which gave evidence of better taste

and more culture ; and that true love of nature, as it is best known to us in the peculiar exhibitions of our native land, began to overflow in lays and stories, which had the true metal and the true ring. Some of the legends of our own land were already old enough to require the helping hand of genius to preserve them, and the salient parts of Yankee and Southern character presented a rich variety of national specimens. At this stage of our progress, or, as we remember it, in the Fall of 1818, there appeared in the New York Evening Post, at irregular and not unfrequent intervals, a series of well-aimed and pleasant satires, which hit the prevalent follies and vices of the city so well and fairly as soon to attract very general notice. The writer was evidently a very familiar spirit, who knew the city, from the Battery flag-staff to Bellevue, and showed himself, moreover, to be a spirit of a kind and genial temperament,—a hobgoblin of the Robin Goodfellow order,—playing his pranks rather for mischief than in malice ; rubbing with his wing, or pecking with his bill, at the blotches and humors of the great world, not forgetting, at the same time, a touch, now and then, on the freckles and pimples which marred the visages of the more lowly and obscure. These little songs bore the signature of Croaker, were easily and fearlessly written, making sport of the learned and the rich, the silly and the bad, and caring as little for the wrath of St. Tammany, as of the Recorder. They were merrily and melodiously put together, just cynical enough to make them piquant, without bitterness, yet sometimes so pointed in their allusions as to excite the wrath of people who had previously thought themselves secure against all newspaper animadversion. In one or two instances, the weak points of some of the magnates, or leaders in politics and fashion, had been so dexterously struck at, that the Editor was, we believe, threatened, and the letter-box watched, in hopes of detecting the culprit. This however only tended to augment the public curiosity and excitement, which continued undiminished for about a year, when it was partially gratified by the discovery that the lyrics in question had been the offspring of a coterie of literary contributors, of which Mr. Fitz Greene Halleck was the principal. This gen-

tleman soon after gave us Fanny, we believe without a name. But the mask had already fallen off, and he has now long been known among us, not only as the author of these first fruits, but also of many other more widely known contributions to our national literature. It is, we think, to be regretted, that most, if not all of the earlier pieces of this author, or his confreres, are now no longer in print, or only to be found in the columns of the Post, where they were first published. For, to our mind, there was a freshness and grace about them which merits preservation. Besides, we have an idea that the vivacity with which this censure was then administered, as well as the happy choice of the personnel upon whose backs it was laid, tended, in no small degree, to check and abate a taste for vicious and expensive indulgence, which was then just beginning in the city, and has, since that time, borne such hideous fruits.

About this time, or soon after, we heard the first chants of Hillhouse, Bryant, Willis and Morris, an early choir, which has since been augmented by Holmes, Saxe, Longfellow, and others, making now a troupe who can easily sing down any merely critical authority which might be brought against them, and have only to fear the danger of becoming too ultra-American and conceited among themselves. But, with due allowance for all the rare merits of this fraternity, we shall always hold Mr. Halleck in peculiar and grateful remembrance, as the first swallow, whose earlier gyrations gave notice of the bounteous and over-laden spring which was about to break upon us. He seems, himself, early to have been aware of the good time that was coming, and in his characteristic and cheery manner, welcomes two of his rivals into the same ring with himself:—

“HILLHOUSE, whose music, like his themes,  
Lifts earth to heaven—whose poet dreams  
Are pure and holy as the hymn  
Echoed from harps of seraphim  
By bards that drank at Zion’s fountains  
When glory, peace and hope were hers,  
And beautiful upon her mountains  
The feet of angel messengers.



BRYANT, whose songs are thoughts that bless

The heart, its teachers and its joy,  
As mothers blend with their caress

Lessons of truth and gentleness  
And virtue for the listening boy.

Spring's lovelier flowers for many a day  
Have blossomed on his wandering way,  
Beings of beauty and decay.

They slumber in their autumn tomb;  
But those that graced his own Green River

And wreathed the lattice of his home,  
Charmed by his song from mortal doom  
Bloom on, and will bloom on for ever.

And HALLECK,—who has made thy roof  
St. Tammany! oblivion proof—

Thy beer illustrious, and thee

A belted Knight of chivalry:

And changed thy dome of painted bricks,

And porter casks and politics

Into a green Arcadian vale,

With Stephen Allen for its lark,

Ben Bailey's voice its watch-dog's bark

And John Targee its nightingale.

It is now almost fifty years since Mr. Halleck was first known among us. And it is matter of regret, that of his many idyls and other vaticinations, there are scarce any which possess either mass or weight enough to ballast them on a voyage of any length to after times. Still more regretful is it that those of finest tissue and most delicate conceit, will be found least capable of preservation through the journey. The lines "to Wyoming," to the 'Wild Rose of Alloway,' and to 'Alnwick Castle,' possessing as they do all the raciness of the author's genius, and his peculiar characteristics of expression, will, we fear, have less chance of lasting fame, than some other productions of more bulk and less merit. It should be the prime duty of every man of genius, to choose some great subject upon which his powers might empty themselves without waste. And albeit we have dread that the age of Epics is past, and that poetry, like politics, must hereafter be made only for immediate consumption, still we are not altogether hopeless that there is yet waste ground in the realms of fancy, whence we may have fresh crops of celestial fruitage that will last for-

ever. But if the race of poets fail, we are now at least sure of this, that there will never again be any dearth of American critics. The Article in the American Monthly for February, to which we have referred, is satisfactory on this point, though we could have wished it to have been written with less irony and more discrimination. It is security that the poets of the country, like the Scottish archers of King Louis' guard, have the privilege of being hanged alone, by Sandie Wilson, the auld marshalsman of their ain body. In other words, that they can never again be visited with more severe censure on the other side of the water than they may expect to receive on this.

## ART. III.—PROVINCES.

IN the discussions which have arisen on this important topic, we notice two heads of objection which deserve a careful consideration. The first, is lack of Primitive precedent; the second, tendency to Papal consolidation. Could either of these objections be sustained, we might well look on the "Provincial System," as it is called, with a good deal of suspicion. Could both be substantiated, it must be abandoned and condemned. We propose to examine these two heads with some minuteness of detail.

Before, however, we proceed to these details, let us follow the sound old rule, and define our terms. What is the "Provincial System?" We confess to no small dislike of the name; but everything now-a-days is a System or an Institution. So the name, we suppose, must pass. The "Provincial System," then, is a union or combination of several Dioceses, for convenience and efficiency of ecclesiastical legislation and administration. So soon as any number of Dioceses are thus combined or united,—whether they have spread out from one centre, as in the earlier days, or aggregated themselves together, as in our own Church, matters not,—the principle of the "Provincial System" is adopted, and all that remains to be discussed is its details.

So it is with ourselves. By uniting in a General Convention, with a Presiding Bishop, we have adopted the *Provincial principle*; and the real question before us to-day, is, simply, whether we will continue one enormous, overgrown Province, or will modify our present cumbrous development of the principle, and have more Provinces than one. Our Presiding Bishop is, to all intents and purposes, a Metropolitan; unless, indeed, those who are afraid of the "Provincial System," choose, rather, to call him a Patriarch. This ought to be distinctly understood. We are not called on, to-day, to consider whether we will or will not adopt the *Provincial principle*;

we have adopted it, and have been acting on it since 1789. But we are to consider, whether we will stop with it where we are, or carry it out further. We are to inquire which is most in accordance with Primitive usage, which looks least like Popery, one overgrown Province, more extensive, territorially, than all Primitive Christendom, with a Bishop at its head, *called* a Presiding Bishop, and, therefore, innocently supposed to have no Metropolitcal character; or a number of Provinces, balancing each other, with a Presiding Bishop over each,—*called* what you please. We are much mistaken if, when the real question is grasped, the common sense of Clergy and Laity does not speedily answer it.

We proceed then, first, to inquire whether the Ante-Nicene testimony favors our present development of the Provincial principle, or that which is *now* termed the "Provincial System." To scholars, this question is simply ridiculous; and *risu solvuntur tabulæ* will express their answer. Still, the testimony is well worth examining.

We begin with the testimony of the Nicene Council itself, and will ascend from it towards the Apostolic age.

The sixth Canon reads:—

"Let the ancient customs [*τὰ ὑποαία ἐθῆ*] be maintained, which are in Egypt and Libya and Pentapolis, according to which the Bishop of Alexandria has authority over all those places. For this is also customary to the Bishop of Rome. In like manner in Antioch, and in the other Provinces, the privileges are to be preserved to the churches. But this is clearly to be understood, that if any one be made a Bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan, the great Synod declares that he shall not be a Bishop. If, however, two or three Bishops shall, from private contention, oppose the common choice of all the others, it being a reasonable one, and made according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, let the choice of the majority hold good."\*

The immediate occasion of the Canon is to be found, doubtless, in the Meletian schism. The details of that difficulty are of no moment to our present inquiry, except that they involved an interference with ancient rights of the Bishop of Alexandria which, in this Canon, are protected and confirmed. The same rights, too, are confirmed to Antioch and Rome, and men-

---

\* Hammond's Translation.

tion is made of "other Provinces." The word translated provinces is *ἐπαρχίας*; and we are aware of no other ecclesiastical signification of *ἐπαρχία* than that which Suicer gives, *provincia quæ subest metropolitano*.\*

And now we ask attention to the clear and cogent argument of Bishop Beveridge.†

"In these words nothing new is decreed; but those ancient privileges which certain Churches had obtained before the memory of men, are simply confirmed by the authority of the Œcumenical Synod; whence it clearly appears that the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and some others, had their own rights and privileges granted to them, long anterior to this first General Council. We need no other proof of this, than that which is afforded by this very Canon of the Nicene Fathers, in that it attributed certain privileges,—which it also calls *ancient*,—to certain Churches over others. Nor does it matter that these privileges are spoken of as *ἰθὺν*, so long as they are also termed *ἀρχαία*. For, as Ulpian says, 'a long-continued custom is wont to be observed as right and law in matters which are not written.' [*Pro jure et lege in his quæ non ex scripto descendunt.*] . . . . Wherefore, since the customs mentioned by the Nicene Fathers were ancient and of long continuance, they were rightly confirmed by them, and that under the very name of ancient customs; so that all might know that they were introducing no novelties into the Church, nor asserting for any Churches any other privileges than those which their ancestors had granted them."

The special privilege or right of the Bishop of Alexandria, which had been violated in the Meletian schism, (and therefore the one confirmed to him and the other Bishops, named or alluded to in the Canon,) was the right of giving or withholding consent to the consecration of a Bishop within his Province, causing, if such consent were not given, the consecration to be uncanonical, schismatic, and null. So that, to quote again from Beveridge:—‡

"Since among the *ancient customs* this is reckoned one, that the Bishop of Alexandria, and the other Metropolitans, shall have power, each in his own province, so that without their consent no Bishop can be canonically ordained, it cannot be doubted that many years before this Synod, in every nation§ or province, there was one Bishop who was called the first, and who, in some way, presided over the others."

\* Suicer's *Thesaurus* on the work.

† Beveridge's *Codex Can. Eccl. Prim. Illustrata*, C. v. de *Metropolitanis*. Sec. i.

‡ As above, *De Metropolitanis*. Sec. ii. § More of this word nation further on.

What, therefore, the Nicene Canon did, was to set forth, by written enactment, an ancient, unwritten privilege, which had been interfered with and infringed upon. The Canon is in no sense creative; it is simply declarative. Its very wording shows that the privilege or right recognized and secured by it, was of ancient date and long standing. No new order of things is introduced; one long in existence is reëstablished and protected.

We pass to an earlier period, and turn to the Church of Africa. And by Africa, we must remind our readers, we do not mean the Continent, nor yet Proconsular Africa, but that strip of country bordering the Mediterranean Sea, and stretching,—to use modern names—from the Atlantic Ocean and the Straits of Gibraltar on the West, to the neighborhood of the Gulf of Sidra on the East. It comprised the three ancient civil Provinces of Proconsular Africa, Numidia, and Mauretania. This is the sense in which the word is generally used by the early Christian writers.\*

Seventy-five years before the Nicene Council, Cyprian, the great early theologian of the West, was Bishop of Carthage, the chief city of this region. Writing to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, he uses this very striking language;† “our Province is more widely spread out, for it has Numidia and Mauretania attached to it.” Besides, he assembled a Synod at Carthage, A. D., 256, the acts of which begin with words that precisely accord with and explain the letter to Cornelius; setting forth, that on a given day, “many Bishops assembled from the Province of Africa, Numidia and Mauretania.”‡ Here, then, in the middle of the third century, is, plainly enough, a Province and a chief Bishop over it.

But, indeed, Cyprian’s position, as a Metropolitan, comes out, naturally and indisputably, in his correspondence. He writes precisely as one occupying such a position would write, and as no other one could; affording thus the most satisfactory evidence that could possibly be given. It is difficult to present this evidence, on account of its abundance, the way in

\* Münter, *Primordia Eccl. Afr.*, C. I.

† Epistle xlv.

‡ Beveridge, as above; compare Baluzius’ Note on Cyprian’s xlvth Epistle.

which it enters into the very texture of his Epistles, and the incidental, and therefore all the more striking, manner in which—we are not sure whether the phrase is slang or scientific—it all along crops out.

A very considerable part of his correspondence is with African Bishops, who appear to have gone to him with all sorts of applications. One writes to ask his advice about a Presbyter, who, he thinks, had been restored too hastily; and also to know how soon after birth infants should be baptized. Another asks whether a stage-player is to be allowed to communicate, so long as he continues his profession. Another lays before him the case of a recalcitrant Deacon. Others consult him about the baptism of heretics. And he replies, as a matter of course, just as a diocesan Bishop would, to letters of his own Clergy, not writing as if he were answering an application made on any personal ground, but treating it as a thing in the ordinary routine of duty and official business. It is all perfectly inexplicable on any other supposition than that of an official position, which occasioned such applications, and warranted such replies. It is all explained—can anything else explain it?—by that little sentence in his letter to Cornelius, “our Province [Africa] has Numidia and Mauretania attached to it.”

But Cyprian’s testimony carries us back to a period much earlier than his own. We learn from his letter to Jubianus, that many years before his time, [*multi jam anni sint et longa ætas*] Agrippinus, a “man of holy memory,” had held a Council of African Bishops on the subject of heretical baptism.\* He alludes to this Council in two other epistles,† in one of which occurs this passage:—

“Which thing Agrippinus, also, a man of holy memory, with his other co-bishops who then governed the Church of God in the Province of Africa and Numidia, settled and determined, after careful deliberation, and with common consent.”

The exact date of this Council is unknown, nor is it of special importance. It is admitted that Agrippinus was a con-

---

\* Ep. lxxiii.

† Ep. lxx, lxxi.



temporary of Tertullian, so that we are carried back to the close of the second, or beginning of the third century; and find, to use the words of Münter, that—

“Proconsular Africa and Numidia, in the time of Agrippinus, constituted one Province, under the Bishop of Carthage, the sole Primate of all Africa.”\*

Let it be also observed, in passing, that the omission of all notice of Mauretania, in Cyprian’s mention of the “Province of Africa and Numidia,” is significant. The African Church began—probably early in the second century—in Proconsular Africa, and its course was westward. The omission of Mauretania would, therefore, indicate that, in the time of Agrippinus, the easternmost Province had not yet been reached, and thus confirm the idea of the comparatively early date of his Synod.

And now we must leave the West, and turn to far distant portions of Christendom.

Towards the close of the second century, the Paschal controversy, which, about forty years earlier, the good sense and Christian moderation of Polycarp and Anicetus had prevented from breaking bounds, was revived, with acrimony and violence. Councils in relation to it were held, not only at Rome, but also in Gaul, Greece, and the East. With the question itself we are, here, nowise concerned. But we propose to follow out the line of Councils, and see what help they give us in the matter in hand.

For the general statement, we may take the words of Eusebius :—†

“Wherefore, there were Synods and Convocations of Bishops on this question. . . . There is extant, even now, an Epistle of those who assembled in Palestine, over whom Theophilus, Bishop of the Diocese of Cæsarea presided, and Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem. There is, also, another Epistle of those in Rome, bearing the name of Victor, the Bishop; one also of the Bishops in Pontus, over whom Palmas, as the most ancient, presided; another of the Dioceses in Gaul, over which Irenæus presided; another, of those in Osroëne, and the cities there; and, in particular, one of Bacchylus, Bishop of the Church of the Corinthians, as, also, of many others.”

---

\* *Primordia*, §c. p. 44. Compare also pp. 26 and 154.

† Tertullian confirms his statement, *De Jejuniis*, c. xiii.

He elsewhere adds, that the Bishop of Asia, "over whom Polycrates presided," held a Council, and that Polycrates addressed an Epistle to Victor, Bishop of Rome. Seven Councils then will come under review.\*

In the notice of the Council in Palestine, two Bishops are named, Theophilus, of Cæsarea, and Narcissus, of Jerusalem. At the first blush, this strikes one strangely, and, if anything, seems to make against the Provincial principle. For, why should two be named? Let us turn to the seventh Nicene Canon:—

"Since a custom and *ancient tradition* has provided, that the Bishop of Ælia [Jerusalem] should be honored, let him have the second place of *honor* saving to the Metropolis [Cæsarea] the *authority* due to it."

What an exact agreement there is here. How completely do the Canon and the account of the Council fit with and explain each other. How clearly it appears that, in forming the Canon, the Nicene Fathers confirmed an arrangement more than a century old, and, therefore, well named by them an "*ancient tradition*." Authority belonged, of old, to Cæsarea; honorary precedence—such as London has in the Province of Canterbury,†—had, of old, been given to Jerusalem. Theophilus presided in the Council; honorary mention is made of Narcissus. It is the very state of things on which the Nicene Fathers rest their action, and by which they justify it.‡

\* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* Lib. v. cc. xxiii. xxiv. We have translated *παρoικία* by the word Diocese. On this point there is no dispute among those for whom we write. But see Suicer on the word, and Bingham, *Antiquities*, Book ix. c. ii., Sec. 1. It is curious to find the Romish author of the Life of Irenæus, in the Benedictine Edition, [p. lxxxiii.] making common cause with the advocates of Parity, and insisting that *παρoικία* does not mean a Diocese. He seems to feel, instinctively, that any Metropolitcal character allowed to Irenæus is in the way of the claims of the Papacy; as instinctively, indeed, as those with whom, for the moment, he sides do, that a Diocesan Episcopacy is in the way of their theory. We may add, for reference, Pearson *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, c. xlii.

† See Hammond's *Note on the Canon*.

‡ It may be noticed—though the point need not be over-pressed—that the word *presided*, in Eusebius, is in the singular, agreeing with Theophilus; as we have endeavored to show in our translation. The "more worthy" position of Theophilus would bring this under a well-known rule of *Syntax*.

As to the Council in Rome, the way in which Victor is mentioned, is explained by the Metropolitan position, recognized at Nice, as belonging, of old, to his See. Bishop Beveridge points out how the same consideration explains the fact, "that before Victor, and for a considerable time afterwards, no other Bishops of Italy than those of Rome are mentioned, though, doubtless, there were many others." Much the same line of remark would apply to the Provinces of Alexandria and Antioch.

In the case of Pontus, a rule different from that which obtained in other cases, and, therefore, specially noticed, seems to have prevailed. Palmas presided there, as the most ancient. The meaning of this phrase is doubtful. Palmas may have been the oldest in years, or in consecration; or the antiquity of his See may be indicated. He was Bishop of Amastris, which was not a Metropolis.\* His position, however, was, clearly, one of authority and rule.

Next in order come the Dioceses of Gaul, under Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons. The testimony of Eusebius must, here, be taken chronologically. The first notice which appears is in connection with the persecution in Gaul, under M. Aurelius, [A. D., 177,] when Lyons and Vienne are spoken of as "Metropoles."† In the account quoted above, of the Council, mention is made of the *Dioceses* in Gaul over which Irenæus presided. We said, in a note, a few words as to the translation of *παροιμία* by Diocese; but it may be well to add here, that Eusebius himself interprets the word—as in many other places—so especially when he says that Irenæus "received the Episcopate of the *παροιμία*, the Diocese, of Lyons,"‡ after Pothinus. And, lastly, Eusebius, in his account of the troubles between Polycrates, of Ephesus, and Victor, of Rome, states that Irenæus wrote a letter to Victor "in the name of the brethren in Gaul over whom he presided."§ Let us put the statements together. Irenæus is Bishop of Lyons, a Metropolis, *presides* over the Dioceses of Gaul, signs a conciliar act, and writes an Epistle in the name of his brethren—namely, in all probability, Bishops—to the Bishop of Rome. If this is not the "Provincial System," what is it?

\* Eusebius, Lib. IV. c. xxiii.

† Euseb. Lib. V. c. v.

‡ Euseb. Lib. V. c. i.

§ Euseb. Lib. V. c. xxiv.

In the case of the Council held in Osrhoëne, no Bishop is mentioned, and we have, therefore, no testimony or date to consider.

The letter of Bacchylus, of Corinth, is mentioned in a way which involves some doubt. The word which we have translated "in particular," is *ιδίως*; and it certainly may be used to indicate something which distinguished the letter of the Corinthian Bishop. So Jerome understood it, when he wrote, "Bacchylus, Bishop of Corinth . . . wrote a wonderful book concerning the Paschal Feast, in the name of all the Bishops who were in Achaia."\* On the other hand, Eusebius may, *possibly*, mean to say, that the letter was private, and not Synodical in character.† This interpretation is not, however, very probable or natural: while the mention of Bacchylus, in a previous chapter, as Bishop of Corinth in Hellas, indicates something specific and prominent in the position of Corinth. It should be observed that Hellas and Achaia might here be used interchangeably, and that Corinth was the Metropolis of Achaia.

The Asian Council remains to be considered. The narrative informs us that ‡ Victor, of Rome, had written to Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, requesting him to convene the Bishops of Proconsular Asia—for that is what Asia here means—that Polycrates did call them together, presided over them, and wrote, in behalf of the great number who assembled, an Epistle in his own name. Why should all this be? Can any simpler, or, indeed, any other answer be given, than that Ephesus was the Metropolis of the Ecclesiastical Province of Asia, as it was, also, of the civil Province of Proconsular Asia, and that Polycrates was, whatever he may have been called, the Metropolitan? Can the narrative mean anything else? And is it not childish to be clamoring for names, so long as we find things?

A contemporary passage of Tertullian throws light on the evidence of these Councils, and is itself, in turn, enlightened by them:—

---

\* Jerome *de Vir. Illustr.* c. xlv.

† He uses the expression *ιδία ἐπιστολή* in this sense, Lib. VI. c. xi.

‡ Euseb. Lib. V. c. xxiv.

"Come now," he says, "you that wish to turn this restlessness to profit, in the search after salvation; run over the Apostolic churches, in which *the very Chairs of the Apostles still preside in their places*, in which their authentic letters are recited, uttering the voice and imaging the person of each one of them. Is Achaia nearest to you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica. If you can reach Asia, you have Ephesus. If you join Italy, you have Rome.\*

Here is, identically, the same arrangement as that which appears in the accounts of the Councils, save only, that in those Macedonia is not spoken of. But in Achaia, Asia, and Italy, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome, respectively, "preside" as Apostolic Sees. The history of Eusebius and the passage from Tertullian, precisely fit with each other; and they fit as precisely with the "Provincial System." Do they fit with anything else?

A few years earlier than the time of these Councils, about A. D., 170, Dionysius was Bishop of Corinth; of whom Eusebius† says:—

"In an Epistle to the Church at Gortyna, and to the other Churches in Crete, he commends their Bishop, Philip. . . . He also wrote to the Church at Amastris, together with those in Pontus. . . . He also adds some expositions of the sacred writings, in which he intimates that Palmas was then Bishop."

Now it is well known that Gortyna was, later on, the Metropolis of Crete,‡ and the hypothesis that it now occupied the same position, under whatever name, explains the way in which it is mentioned here. We must also call our readers' attention to the confirmation of the account of the Council in Pontus, and of the position of Palmas, which the latter portions of the extract afford.

---

\* *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. xxxvi.

† *Hist. Eccl. Lib. IV. c. xxlii.* Although it is foreign to our immediate topic, we cannot refrain from adding a few words of another, as to the value of the History of Eusebius. "Never was a work of its kind more abundant, in proportion to its size, in extracts and documents. He has handed down an account of the labors of writers, of whose very names we should otherwise have been ignorant. In a word, he established the only Christian history upon the most satisfactory foundation; and set an example of diligence and accuracy, which have never been surpassed, and rarely equalled by his successors." Dowling, *Study of Eccl. Hist.* p. 16.

‡ Bingham's *Antiquities*, Book IX. c. iv. Sec. 11.

A still more venerable witness will carry us back to the very beginnings of the second century, and, indeed, connect us with Apostolic times. In his Epistle to the Romans, Ignatius, of Antioch, calls himself "*Bishop of Syria*." And later on, asking from all Churches their prayers, he speaks of the Church in Syria as having no Bishop on earth after his death. Bishop Pearson's comment says all that is needed here :—

"Since Antioch was the head and Metropolis of Syria, and he was Bishop of Antioch, he not improperly calls himself Bishop of Syria. For, though the name, Metropolitan, was not yet employed, nevertheless, the Bishop of the Metropolis had some rights over the Churches in other cities, which, by Roman law, was subject to the Metropolis."\*

And now, to bind all this testimony together, and to give it cohesion and consistency, we have the Apostolic Canon :—

"The Bishops of every *nation* ought to own him who is chief among them, and esteem him as their head, and do nothing extraordinary without his consent, but every one only those things which concern his own See, and the country subject to it. But neither let him [the chief] do anything without the consent of all."†

The only question as to the translation and meaning of the Canon—*παρουσία* has been spoken of before—grows out of the word *nation*, in the original *ἐθνους*; a word which cannot, here, signify gentiles, or heathen, or anything of the sort. We may obtain some help in arriving at its meaning from St. Luke's account of the Miracle at Pentecost."‡

"And there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, out of every *nation* [*παντὸς ἐθνους*] under heaven. . . . Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes, and Arabians."

The word is used also in the same way in the Martyrdom of Ignatius, where the "Scythians, Dacians, and many other nations [*ἔθνη*]"§ are mentioned.

Now this gives an insight into the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic use of the word *ἔθνη*, when it did not signify the Gentiles,

\* Jacobson, *Patres Apostolici*, Vol. II. pp. 350, 369.

† The Canon is variously numbered, xxvii, xxxiii, xxxv.

‡ Acts, ii. 5, 9, 10, 11.

§ Sec. II.

and was not applied to the Jews. It indicates a people occupying a comparatively small space. It did not include even those who spoke one language. For the Medes and Elamites or Persians spoke the same language, only in different dialects.

It is worthy of note, also, that while there may be some difficulty in placing the Parthians and Medes, yet every other *nation* and place mentioned by St. Luke, and in the Martyrdom, became one Ecclesiastical Province.\* The customary translation, therefore, in the Canon of ἐθνη by *Province*, is not, probably wide of the mark. Anyhow, the Canon recognizes the "Provincial System," and harmonizes exactly with the historical notices which have been brought under consideration.

A word—and our limits forbid more—must be added as to the date of the Apostolic Canons. The general opinion of our own scholars is, we believe, that of Beveridge, that they are all a compilation of laws made, not at one time, or one place, but by various Councils of the second and third centuries; and that they represent the law and practice of the Church for at least a century and a half before the Nicene Council.†

And now, shall we—not pretending to have exhausted it—sum up our evidence? If we consider it in its relations to time, it runs back from the Nicene Synod, step by step, to at least the second decade of the first century after the Apostles. If we consider it in its relations to the extent of Christendom, it comes from all parts and portions of the Church; wherever the Church is, it is. If we consider its character, how variously it comes out in historical statements, in Synodical Letters and decisions, in official correspondence, in hints and observations, all of which fit, joint, articulate themselves together, all agreeing in, all adjusting themselves with, all explicable by, and therefore, all witnessing to the "Provincial System."

Nor is it difficult to see how this System grew naturally and necessarily, on the one hand, out of the growth, the relations, and the circumstances of the Church, just as the Parochial System did, out of different relations and circumstances, on the other

\* This is proved by a comparison of the names with the *Notitiæ* given by Bingham, Book IX.

† See, especially, the work so often quoted above.



hand ; having, by the way, no more to do with Popery, than the other had with Congregationalism. When the Apostles, "beginning at Jerusalem," went forth to spread the Church and propagate the Faith, they found the Roman Empire divided into Provinces, in the chief cities of which they first planted the Cross. To see this, we only need to study the records of Missionary effort and journeying, in the Book of Acts ; while the very superscriptions of St. Paul's Epistles, when they are carefully considered, help us to understand it.\* Then, as from these centres, the Church spread out, as, in its entirety it had done from Jerusalem, and other Sees grew up around the original one in the chief city of the civil Province, and legislation and administration required Synodical consultation and action, the Ecclesiastical Province was formed, coterminous, naturally, with the civil Province. So that we should, *a priori*, expect just that result which, as we have seen, comes out in the history of the early centuries.

As time went on and the Empire became Christian, and the Emperors acquired an influence and a voice in the arrangements of the Church, these Provinces were changed and multiplied. Still, we have a curious proof that their ancient and primitive arrangement was not destroyed. For the twelfth Canon of Chalcedon, reads as follows :—

"It has come to our knowledge, that some persons, contrary to the laws of the Church, having had recourse to the secular powers, have, by means of pragmatic orders, [i. e. imperial rescripts,] divided one Province into two, so that there are thus two Metropolitans in one Province. The Holy Synod has therefore determined that no Bishop shall, for the future, dare to do any such thing, and that he who shall attempt such a thing shall be deposed from his own rank. Such cities, however, as have been already honored with the name of Metropolis by royal letters, and the Bishop who has charge of the Church of such a city, shall enjoy the *honorary title only*, the *proper rights* being preserved to that which is *in truth* the Metropolis."

With this citation we close our first line of inquiry, which, we think, has established the primitive character of the "Provincial System," and proved that the Nicene Fathers spake

---

\*Beveridge, *de Metropolitans*: compare a striking passage in Blunt's *First Three Centuries*.

advisedly, and meant what they said, when they called it an *ancient custom*.

But, we are told, the "Provincial System" was the parent of the Papacy. Popes, it is said, were a legitimate development of Metropolitans; Metropolitans are embryo Popes. When this difficulty is raised, if there is any very definite idea in the mind of the objector, he must have reference to the Spiritual Supremacy of the Papacy. He can hardly allude to the Temporal Power. The fact that by the year 700, the Pope was the richest land owner in Italy, the gift of territory by the Lombard King, Luitprand, the still richer and more extensive donation of Pepin, of France, the grant of Charlemagne,—it is difficult to see what connection these things have with Metropolitans and Provinces. Nay, it may as well be remembered, that in order to carry out their plans, the Archbishopric of Ravenna was assumed, by two Popes, to themselves! It cannot be the Temporal Power, then, that we must consider here, but the Spiritual Supremacy.

We remember, years ago, to have seen, somewhere, the shrewd observation, that there was a sense in which Popery grew out of the Primitive Church; that is to say, that the Primitive Church was capable of being *corrupted* and *perverted* into Popery. History proves the truth of this assertion. And we may carry out the observation even further, and say, that could any Church organization, doctrine, or worship prove that it could, by no possibility be thus *corrupted* or *perverted* into Popery, it would only prove that it was not the organization, doctrine, or worship of the Primitive Church.

In this sense, then, Popery might follow Metropolitans and Provinces, as indeed it did; but so it might, also, follow Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, or the two Orders of Presbyterianism, or the no-particular-Orders of Congregationalism. In all these cases, the questions would remain to be asked and answered,—Is this a true development, or only a corruption? Has it grown out of these things, or displaced them? Is the process one of carrying out, or of destroying? We may as well say, at once, that we regard the assertion that the Papacy grew out of Metropolitans and Provinces, if anything more is

meant by it than what we have just said, as a patent instance of that most vulgar of all fallacies, *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. In any other view than the one indicated above, Metropolitans and Provinces have just as much to do with Popery as, in old Latimer's sermon, Tenterden steeple had with the Goodwin sands, and they have no more.

What, more than anything else, gave the Roman Church power and rule over other Churches? Appellate jurisdiction. And this—though often claimed as granted at Nice—was first given by the Council of Sardica in 347. The third Canon of that Council allowed an appeal from *Provincial Judgments*, to the Bishop of Rome. In other words, it overrode the rights of Metropolitans, in favor of the Roman See. And from that day forward, it was by the extinction of Metropolitan as well as Episcopal rights, that Rome advanced; till this Sardican grant—intended perhaps only to be given to Julius of Rome personally—of authority “to receive and try appeals of Bishops, who wished to appeal from the decisions of Synods,” was enlarged into “authority to evoke causes to Rome, to summon Bishops, *ex-officio*, and to proceed to review and set aside the Judgments of Councils.\* The great barriers *against* the Papacy, were, first, Diocesan, and next, Metropolitan Bishops. And the way that Popery grew out of them, was by destroying them.

The student of Ecclesiastical History can readily test the entire correctness of this assertion. Take the case of Damasus, Bishop of Rome, (A. D. 366,) and the way in which, by the aid of the Emperor Gratian, he subjected the Metropolitans; take the instance of Innocent I., (A. D. 402,) and his assumptions of hyper-Metropolitan power over Illyria, rebuked, as they afterwards were, by an Imperial statute; take the attempt of Zosimus (A. D. 417) to transfer the Metropolis of Southern France from Vienne to Arles; and, later on, of Leo I., (A. D. 440,)+ to change it back to Vienne; take the far later instance of Hincmar, of Rheims; take, in a word, the

---

\* Hussey's Rise of the Papal Power, p. 5.

† The dates are those of the accessions of the Popes.

whole course of History, and the conclusion is the same. The Papacy was elevated on the ruins of Metropolitan and Diocesan power. And this, we think, can hardly be called a development.

Whatever else, then, the Provincial System may be, it is *Primitive* and *anti-Papal*. Under what modifications, and in what precise form, it shall be received among us, is a question which demands our careful consideration. *In some form or another, we must have it.* In one cumbrous, unwieldy, dangerous form, we have it now. Shall we never have it in any other?

## ART. IV.—THE MORAVIANS AND THE MORAVIAN EPISCOPATE.

- (1.) *Spangenberg's Life of Nicholas Lewis Count Zinzendorf*, Bishop and Ordinary of the Church of the United Brethren. London: 1838.
- (2.) *Text Book of Church History*. By Dr. JOHN HENRY KURTZ. Vol. II. Philadelphia: 1862.
- (3.) *John Wesley's Journal; Philip's Life and Times of Whitefield; Burk's Life of Bengel, &c., &c.*

AMONG the plans lately proposed for the restoration of Unity among Protestants, one is, that Non-Episcopalians shall consent to a sort of compromise, by consenting to receive the Episcopate and Episcopal Ordination from the Moravians. This, it is urged, will enable Protestant Episcopal Churchmen to regard their Orders as valid, and so prepare the way for something like Visible Unity among us.

Now, we see, in the outset, several objections to any such scheme as this. In the first place, we have not observed the first intimation that the Sects about us desire any such Visible Unity, or any real Visible Unity whatsoever. As far as they have indicated any feeling or any opinion on the subject, they do not regard such Unity as of the slightest importance; nay, many of them are evidently opposed to it, and would, if really called out, contend against it with all their might. The Rev. Dr. Bacon, of New Haven, Conn.,—a clear-headed man, who represents the Congregational theory, and which is the prevailing theory throughout large portions of the North and North-West, recently furnished a paper for one of the meetings of the Christian Union Society, in which this whole matter of outward Visibility was treated, (from his stand-point,) logically and ably. The paper, however, was quietly and significantly ignored; though it was, in fact, *the* paper of the meeting. The fundamental principle of Congregationalism is,

that the Christian Ministry is not a positive Institution of Jesus Christ ; but that it *originates*, immediately and directly, from the people ; in whom, primarily, this power is supposed to be lodged ; in other words, startling as the position appears, that the people, not Jesus Christ, are the true ultimate source of Ecclesiastical and Ministerial power. And then, as to the *nature* of the Ministry itself ; it is contended, by Congregationalists,—and we believe it to be held by nineteen-twentieths of the New School Presbyterians,—that the Christian Ministry is not a distinct Order of men ; and hence, strictly speaking, that there is no such thing as a Christian Ministry in distinction from the people at large.

In proof that we have stated this theory correctly, we quote from the "Congregational Catechism," the modern text-book of the System, and we commend the extracts to those among us who believe that Unity with these Sects is among the things either possible or desirable :—

QUESTION 13. "Where does all Ecclesiastical power and authority reside?" ANSWER. "Primarily in the individual communities or local Churches."<sup>\*</sup>

QUES. 14. "Whence does a local Church derive all its power?"

ANS. "From the good pleasure of God, authorizing and requiring Christians to form themselves into Churches, and to regulate all their proceedings according to their discretion, in conformity with the laws of God."<sup>†</sup>

QUES. 16. "What is it that imparts official power to the officers of a Church?" ANS. "Their election or appointment by the Church, according to its by-laws, and their formal induction into office agreeably to the same laws."<sup>‡</sup>

QUES. 54. "*Did Ordination convey to the person official powers which he could not otherwise possess?*" ANS. "*No.* The ordination was rather a recognition of him as one already clothed with official powers by virtue of his previous election or appointment to office."<sup>§</sup>

QUES. 56. "Who had the power of ordaining officers in the primitive Church?" ANS. "Those, doubtless, who had the power of electing or appointing such officers, provided they were competent to conduct the solemn exercises in a proper manner ;" that is, the people,<sup>||</sup> &c.

QUES. 57. "*Did the officers of the primitive Church, by virtue of their ordination, become a distinct order of men from the people?*" ANS. "*No ! They did not become a distinct order of men,*" &c.<sup>¶</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Cong. Cat., p. 12. <sup>†</sup> Ibid., p. 13. <sup>‡</sup> Ibid., p. 13. <sup>§</sup> Ibid., p. 47. <sup>||</sup> Ibid., p. 48. <sup>¶</sup> Ibid., pp. 48, 49.

The above quotations leave us no room to doubt what this modern theory is, in respect to the origin and nature of the Christian Ministry.

In respect to the basis of Doctrine, in this new plan of Unity, it is proposed that the Sects about us shall simply come back to the Nicene Creed, as an authoritative standard of the Faith ; and that we shall meet together upon that common platform. This is all very well, in theory. The giving up of the Primitive *Creeds* for metaphysical and philosophical interpretations of those *Creeds*, was, undoubtedly, the bane and curse of the Protestant Sects ; and has led, by logical and necessary sequence, to the horrible dogmas of modern Rationalism and Infidelity. But will these Sects come back to the Primitive *Creeds* ? That is the question. Individuals might agree to do this, perhaps ; but the great body of the Sects will not, and cannot do it, without stultifying themselves. They, for example, who still adhere to the Calvinistic theory, of course will not do it ; and they, on the other hand, who have swung to the opposite extreme of Rationalism, who have given up the doctrine of Inspiration, of the Fall, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Trinity, the Covenant, and Sacraments,—these men, most assuredly, will not accept the Nicene Creed, in its plain and honest interpretation. So that, in respect to Doctrine, as well as Order and Discipline, we see no prospect of Visible Unity on the plan proposed.

But, suppose that we are mistaken, as to the temper and disposition of the Sects on the subject of Visible Unity. Suppose that they are conscious of the evils and the sin of Schism, and of the multiform Heresies which naturally are springing up among them. Suppose them to be ardently desirous to return to Unity, on what we believe to be the true and only possible basis of such Unity, to wit, the Faith, Order, and Worship of the Ante-Nicene Church ; what hinders such a return now ? There is no compromise about it, either necessary or possible. It is not *our* basis, in the sense of belonging exclusively to us as Churchmen ; or, to use the common term, Protestant Episcopalians. It is simply the basis of the Church, as it was confessedly founded by the Apostles, under the promised



guidance of the Holy Ghost. It is simply the Church, as it was in the days of her pristine simplicity, purity, power, and glory. It is the Church *sub cruce*, as it used to be called ; the Church under the shadow of the Cross ; or, rather, under the very Cross itself. This, of course, is the old Catholic rule, the "*semper, ubique, ab omnibus.*" This is what Tertullian means, when he says : "This principle avails against all heresies. Whatsoever is first, is true ; whatsoever is later, is adulterate." Given, the supernatural establishment of Christianity AS AN INSTITUTION ; and from this rule there is no appeal. So the English Reformers believed ; and so they acted. And the Anglican Reformed Church stood forth, restored to its primitive purity and beauty ; Catholic, for every Truth of God ; Protestant, against every Error of man. This rule, of course, gives the death-blow to Popery, ancient and modern ; as Brownson, the ablest Romish controversialist in this country, confessed, not long since : "These [developmentists] not accepting the authority of the Church, *cannot, without such theory, get over the difficulties presented to their minds by the Fathers, nor can we, without it, satisfactorily explain those difficulties to them.*"

Why then, we say again, go to the Moravians, as a sort of middle ground between the Church and the Sects, and on which middle ground we are to meet them in the way of compromise ? compromise of what ? If there is an essential principle involved, have we any such principles to sacrifice ? And if we have, and we are ready to make it, is that the way to purchase a solid, substantial, lasting peace ? Not if we understand the practical retributions of the divine economy, or the lessons of history, or the laws of human nature. If the Sects are simply mistaken, in their ecclesiastical position, and we honestly believe they are, let them simply change their base ; let them merely come back to the Primitive Church, as their pattern. That is all. If it makes them Episcopalians, instead of Presbyterians and Independents, we cannot help it. If it gives them the Old Creeds, and a Primitive Liturgic Worship, it only benefits them and does not injure us. In such a step, there is no compromise called for, on either side.

If, however, they will insist on a return to Visible Unity,

but not through the Succession of the American branch of the Church, then we have a right, and it is our duty, to demand two things; 1st, that this restoration to Unity, shall be through a Ministry, whose primitive and Apostolic character is unquestionable; and 2d, that it shall be through some branch of the Church whose past history and present condition as to Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, render it fully worthy of our respect and confidence. And here we come to the special subject of our present examination. Are the Moravians such a branch of the Church? Have they an unquestionably Apostolic Ministry? Is their past history in respect to Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, such that we are willing thus to give them a virtual endorsement?

On both these points, we are more than doubtful. In respect to the Ministry, the subject has been so thoroughly examined by an English writer, that we shall reprint his argument entire, at the conclusion of this Article. It covers the whole ground, and is so far exhaustive, as to put the reader in possession of all the main facts bearing upon the subject. These he can judge for himself; and we see not how he can come to any other conclusion than that the regularity and validity of the Orders of the Moravian Ministry are at least exceedingly doubtful.

In respect to the internal history of the Moravians, the state of practical religion among them, of Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, we cannot but believe that a most erroneous impression prevails among us. An outline of their exterior life and history will be found in the paper to which we have alluded. But almost nothing is generally known among us, respecting the real character and the past internal history of the Moravians themselves. We have ordinarily heard of them, as a body of Christians somewhat insignificant in numbers, yet of certain strongly marked features; possessing an earnest missionary zeal; exhibiting a spirit of persistence, and self-sacrifice, worthy of all praise. Their recognition by the British Parliament, and by certain English Bishops, during the first half of the last century,—concerning which more will be said in the paper reprinted below,—the Missions of the Moravians to

this country, especially to the Indians, so also the character of the Moravian settlements themselves in this country, which have been, to a large extent, free from many of the gross abuses and corruptions of the System, in its earlier days,—all this, has given to the Moravians a general reputation, by which they have been favorably known. It is due, however, to ourselves, due to the Moravians, due to the cause of truth, due to the Church of Christ, especially if the question of communion and fellowship with them is to be brought before us as a practical matter, that we should know more respecting the doctrinal belief, the interior life and character, the inspiring genius and controlling element, the practical operations and historic developments, of the Moravian Christians.

Every new Sect is based upon the revival of some forgotten or neglected truth, or principle, or duty. The essence of Sect consists in giving to such development of an individual truth or duty a central, controlling position and power; in substituting one truth, for the whole circle and body of Truths. Count Zinzendorf, under whom the "Renewed Fraternity" came prominently before the world, and who may be called the father and founder of the present Moravian System, was a remarkable man. He had many of the elements of what is called a "Reformer." He had genius, wealth, rank, zeal, energy, and industry. He had that sort of magnetic presence and power, which made him a central, rallying point; so that, unconsciously, and we may say, at first undesignedly, he became a leader, a representative man. He had more than all this. In that deadly stupor, that internal spiritual decay and corruption, which had already taken possession of the Lutheran body, one great truth was ignored. It was the Atoning Sacrifice of the Cross.

That truth, Zinzendorf seized hold of with all his heart. It became a passion with him. Among the little band of refugees who gathered around him at Herrnhut, in 1722, he found his first field of labor; and there, was developed the germ of that system which afterwards, during the remaining almost forty years of his life, grew into such large proportions. Like John Wesley and Whitefield, in the depth and engrossing

power of his religious character,—like them, in his ability to infuse his own wonderful spiritual vitality into the hearts of others, and mould them to his will, he was, yet, most unlike John Wesley in the constructive and administrative element. Whether Wesley did not owe his success in this respect to the English Church, in which he had been educated, and to which he clung to the very last, may fairly be asked. And, that Moravianism depended, for its permanency, on the organic form into which it grew mainly through English influence, is a point on which we see no room for doubt. But Count Zinzendorf built up his System, at first, without any system or method. It grew up without any organic type, like that which is hidden in the heart of the acorn. Zinzendorf did not, at first, intend to found a Sect. As Spangenberg says; “Those are right, who regard the Congregations of the United Brethren as institutions, as founded by our Lord Jesus Christ *in His Church*, in order to present a barrier to the flood of corruption now breaking in upon doctrine and life.”\* It seemed expedient to have an Episcopacy, at a certain period, and so he sought and pretended to have Episcopacy. He saw the necessity, at certain crises, of having some avowed System of Faith or doctrinal belief; and then he professed to hold to the Augsburg Confession; yet Pietists, and Separatists, and Calvinists, flocked to his standard, united by a bond of *love*, not of *faith*.

The life and history of Zinzendorf, from the year 1722 to the year 1760, when he died, is the history of Moravianism itself. We do not attempt a sketch of that history here. All that we propose, is, to notice some of its more peculiar features, growing largely out of the idiosyncracies and weaknesses and faults of Count Zinzendorf; and so, to correct popular misapprehensions as to the System.

A leading feature of Zinzendorf's plan, in the outset, and he never lost sight of it, was that to which we have already alluded, and which he borrowed from Spener, *The Ecclesiola in Ecclesia*, the little Churches within the Church; the gathering together, in the most intimate communion and fellowship, and

---

\* *Idea Fidei Fratrum*, p. 542.

bound by special vows, of those who were regarded as truly sincere and holy, and the adoption of a distinct mode of life and spiritual discipline, adapted to such seraphic beings. Bengel detected this weakness in the System, in the outset; saw in it the germs of mischief, and witnessed against it. This feature of Moravianism seems to cling somewhat to the System even now. Its members, apparently, do not wish for such identification in the One Body of Christ, as shall ignore their pretension to superior sanctity. They seem to be reformers, a "peculiar people," by profession. A similar exhibition we have seen in our own day, in those Spiritual Homes or Communities, which grew out of the intense Spiritualism of a quarter of a century ago, and yet which, as a matter of fact, have become the dens of such abominable uncleanness and impiety. Zinzendorf's rejection of *Creeds* and adoption of *feeling*, as the only test of piety, led, to some extent, to just such results. His biographer, Spangenberg, who was his personal friend and admirer, and also a "Bishop," though he writes with great caution, yet admits, incidentally, the degree to which this intense spiritualism, and mysticism, and sensuous emotionalism, perverted the judgment, and was fruitful in ungodliness of living. We shall see more of this, hereafter, and especially in the Letter of Whitefield, which we shall give presently.

As a specimen of the religious discipline of the Moravians, we cite a passage or two from his friendly biographer, Spangenberg. The Count determined, in 1741, "to bear testimony to the Genevese Church, where, formerly, the great John Calvin had taught." So, taking forty or fifty chosen "brethren and sisters," he goes to Switzerland. His biographer says:—

"The Count's residence, therefore, constituted a little Church in Geneva, with all its different choirs. Each choir held first its own matins. The whole Church then came together, and the Count then gave them an address. At eight o'clock in the evening, they again assembled, and edified each other with singing; on which a Bible lesson followed, with some of the learned brethren, at which others were also present. Afterwards, the brethren and sisters assembled, who divided the hours with each other, *from four in the morning till midnight*, for intercession and converse with the Lord. At the same time, there was an evening service for those who were not of that com-

pany; and from twelve till four o'clock, there was a night watch for prayer, which was held by the brethren in turns," &c.\*

Whitefield, in the Letter which we shall give below, alludes more particularly to the manner in which these services were conducted.

To show the extent to which spiritual delusion grew up among the Moravians, we make another extract from his biographer.

"About this time, various gifts and spiritual powers manifested themselves in the Church at Herrnhut, and, in particular, many miraculous cures. Its members believed, in filial simplicity, the words which the Saviour spoke respecting the hearing of prayer; and when any particular affair pressed itself upon them, they spoke with him concerning it, and expected every good thing from him; and it was done unto them according to their faith. The Count heartily rejoiced at this, and secretly praised the Saviour, who looks with such condescension on the poor and needy.†"

What this biographer calls the Count's "familiar intercourse with the Saviour," was another feature which helps to explain his character. In the Count's address at Geneva, he says; "for more than fifty years, I have conversed, as it were, personally, with the Saviour, and feel happier every day in doing so." And in his earlier years, the biographer tells us, that sometimes, when he had pen, ink and paper before him, he wrote a little note to his beloved Saviour,—told Him in it how his heart felt towards Him, and threw it out of the window, in the hopes that He would find it." &c., &c.‡

It is not strange, that with a man like Count Zinzendorf, a man of high civil rank and office, which he still retained, a man of large wealth, around whom devotees from different governments and principalities gathered, bound together and to him, by secret vows; and all this, too, where the Union of Church and State obtained; and where civil and religious Wars raged furiously—we say, it is not strange that the Moravian communities became a frequent source of suspicion and political trouble. In consequence of complaints made to the Privy Council, the Count was banished from Herrnhut, and

---

\* Spangenberg's *Life of Count Zinzendorf*. London: 1838. p. 293.

† *Ib.* p. 136.

‡ *Ib.* p. 4.



from Saxony, for ten years ; at a later date, the Moravian settlers at Herrnhag were banished by the Government at Büdingen, and sought refuge in America ; and he himself was banished, by the Empress of Russia, from her territories. So also, though on different grounds, the Synod of Holland issued a Pastoral Letter, warning "the members of the Dutch Church" against "opinions which did not accord with the doctrines of Christ and His Apostles."<sup>\*</sup> In England, whither he went repeatedly, and where he spent a considerable portion of the later years of his life, he sought and obtained from Parliament, in 1749, a recognition of the United Brethren, as "An Ancient Protestant Episcopal Church," and he also had frequent conferences with Archbishop Potter, Dr. Sherlock, Bishop of London, and the Bishop of Lincoln. In 1737, Archbishop Potter made a formal statement to the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, that the Moravians were an Apostolic and Episcopal Church ; and this he did, in part most certainly, on testimony which Count Zinzendorf himself laid before him ;<sup>†</sup> and so the Moravian Missionaries passed into the employ of the Venerable Society. This was the one point aimed at by Parliament, and the English Bishops ; and, ostensibly, it was so, on the part of Count Zinzendorf.

The most, then, that can be fairly drawn from the recognition of the Moravians by Parliament in certain Acts, and by the English Bishops, is, that the Moravians were Episcopal in form, and held to the Augsburg Confession ; and so might be looked to, to help supply the pressing spiritual wants in the American Colonies. If the statement of Archbishop Potter, in 1737, seems to mean more than this, yet there is proof in the testimony of Dr. Doddridge, as given by the biographer of Whitefield, which we shall cite presently, that the Archbishop subsequently had occasion to change his opinion as to the Moravian Episcopate.

On this point of the recognition of Moravian Episcopacy in England, there are several things to be noticed. Dates are

---

<sup>\*</sup> Life of Zinzendorf, p. 247.

<sup>†</sup> *Ib.* p. 227.



sometimes an important item in an argument. Spangenberg, the Count's biographer, says :—

"The Count, seeing that these Prelates, [the Bishop of London, and the Bishop of Lincoln,] as well as others of the Church of England, would be glad of a more particular account of the Doctrine, Constitution, and practice of the Moravian Church, wrote a copious treatise upon the subject in English."\*

This was in 1749, twelve years after the statement of Archbishop Potter ; and it shows, clearly enough, that the true Churchly character of Moravianism was not, by any means, a settled point in England. Besides this, during all this time, American Churchmen in the Colonies were pleading and interceding with the English Church for an Apostolic Episcopate.† Why were not these men referred to the Moravian Bishops, two of whom, Hitschman and Zinzendorf, had both travelled in this country ? The English Church Missionaries, in their correspondence with the Mother Church, allude to these Moravian "Bishops ;" but never in a manner as recognizing the validity of their Orders.‡ Subsequently, when Seabury went to England to obtain a primitive and Apostolic Episcopacy, why was he not reminded of the Moravian Episcopate ? This was unshackled by State fetters, and might have put an end, at once, to all his difficulties, if it were what he wanted. That Moravian Episcopacy was alluded to in Seabury's interview with the Archbishop of Canterbury ; but never as acknowledging its validity ; while the Correspondence of Dr. Berkeley, son of the noble Dean and Bishop, with Bishop Skinner, of Scotland, is negative proof, of the strongest possible kind, that the spurious character of Moravian Episcopacy was perfectly well understood.§ This whole subject of the origin and character of the Moravian Episcopate is, however, thoroughly examined in the paper of the Hon. and Rev. Dr. Perceval, which we give below, and to that we now refer the reader.

That, in seeking recognition from the English Bishops, and from Parliament, Zinzendorf had also in view an increase of his own personal authority and power, is more than intimated by

\* Life of Zinzendorf, 389.

† See *Am. Quar. Church Review* Vol. IV. pp. 548-579.

‡ Hawks' and Perry's *Documentary History*, Vol. II. p. 101.

§ *Ib.* pp. 238-9.

Whitefield, in the Letter to which we have alluded. Certain it is, that so much cumbersome machinery, and becoming all the while more and more difficult to manage, demanded one ruling and directing head, in order to its working smoothly ; and that agency, the Count supplied in his own person. His biographer says :—" At the Synod held in London, in 1741, he had been commissioned, after mature deliberation, to take charge of the affairs of the brethren, and their Missions, *with unlimited authority*, and continue to do so, as long as the case required it."<sup>\*</sup>

In England, the Count, of course, attracted the attention of Mr. Whitefield, and of the Wesleys, whose spiritual life had been quickened by the preaching of the Moravian preacher, Peter Möhler. These men studied carefully the character of the man, of his measures, doctrine, and system. Won, at first, by the earnest zeal of a man whose apparent aim was to revive pure and undefiled religion, they soon found cause to withdraw, utterly, from all association with him. The biographer of Charles Wesley says, Zinzendorf's " theology, as he advanced in years, became more unsound, and his influence increasingly mischievous ;" while John Wesley was estranged, as by other causes, so also by the Antinomianism of the Moravians, and their Quietism, which they had learned from Madame Guion and other French mystic writers. Mr. Whitefield took equally decided ground, not only in renouncing, but denouncing the Sect, when he saw what corruptions had already arisen in it. Mr. Philip, in his *Life and Times of Whitefield*, says, the *vagaries* of the Moravians,—

" First alarmed, and then alienated, both Watts and Doddridge, as well as Whitefield and Wesley. Doddridge was right, too, in supposing that '*they produced the same sentiments in the Archbishop of Canterbury.*' Potter could forgive much to a people whom he recognized as an 'Apostolic and Episcopal Church;' but he seems to have doubted, eventually, whether Zinzendorf was elected their Bishop, '*plaudente toto caelesti choro.*'"<sup>†</sup>

Whitefield met the matter boldly. He wrote publicly to Count Zinzendorf, in the spirit of a man whose confidence had

<sup>\*</sup> *Life of Count Zinzendorf*, pp. 340-1.

<sup>†</sup> *Life of Whitefield*, p. 410.

been alienated, and his sympathies outraged. From his long Letter, we make a few extracts :—

“Pardon me, therefore; my lord, if at length, though with great regret, as the Searcher of hearts knows, I am constrained to inform your lordship, that *you*, together with some of your *leading brethren*, have been unhappily instrumental in misguiding many real, simple, honest-hearted Christians; of distressing, if not totally ruining, numerous families; and introducing a whole farrago of superstitions, not to say idolatrous fopperies, into the English Nation.”

Mr. Whitefield thus proceeds to substantiate these charges. He says :—

“What instances have we of the first Christians walking round the graves of their deceased friends on Easter-day, attended with haut-boys, trumpets, French-horns, violins, and other musical instruments? Or, where have we the least mention made of pictures of particular persons being brought into the first Christian assemblies, and of candles being placed behind them, in order to give a transparent view of the figures? Where was it ever known that the picture of the Apostle Paul, representing him handing a gentleman and lady up to the side of Jesus Christ, was ever introduced into the primitive love-feasts? . . . And yet, your lordship knows both these have been done for *you*, and suffered by *you*; without your having shown, as far as I can hear, the least dislike.” . . .

“Again, my lord, I beg leave to inquire, whether we hear anything in Scripture of Elderesses or Deaconesses of the Apostolical Churches, seating themselves before a table, covered with artificial flowers; and against that, a little altar, surrounded with wax tapers, on which stood a cross, composed either of mock or real diamonds, or other glittering stones? And yet, your lordship must be sensible this was done, in Fetter-Lane Chapel, for Mrs. Hannah Nitschman, the present General-Elderess of your Congregation; with this addition, that all the sisters were seated, clothed in white, and with German caps; the organ also illuminated with three pyramids of wax tapers, each of which was tied with a red riband; and over the head of the General-Elderess was placed her own picture; and over that, (*horresco referens*), the picture of the Son of God.” . . .

“A like scene to this was exhibited by the single brethren, in a room of their house at Hatton Garden. . . . The floor was covered with sand and moss; and in the middle of it was paved a star, of different colored pebbles; upon that was placed a gilded dove, which spouted water out of its mouth, &c., &c. The Count, his son, and son-in-law, in honor of whom all this was done, with Mrs. Hannah Nitschman and Mr. Peter Böehler, and some other laborers, were present. These were seated under an alcove, supported by columns made of paste-board, and over their heads was painted an oval, an imitation of marble, containing the ciphers of Count Zinzendorf's family. Upon a side table was a little altar covered with shells; and on each side of the altar was a bloody heart, out of or near which

proceeded flames. The room was illuminated with wax tapers; and musicians played in an adjoining apartment, while the company performed their devotions, and regaled themselves with sweetmeats, coffee, tea, and wine."

"But this is not all. I have another question to propose to your lordship. Pray, my lord, did any of the Apostles, or leaders of the primitive Churches, ever usurp an authority, not only over people's consciences, *but their properties also?* or, draw in the members of their respective congregations, to dispose of whole patrimonies at once? or, to be bound, for thousands of pounds more than they well knew they were worth? And yet, your lordship knows this has been done, again and again, in order to serve the purposes of the brethren for several years last past; and that, too, *at, or very near the time, when, in order to procure an Act in their favor to go abroad, (which now appears to be rather a scheme to settle at home,)* they boasted to an English Parliament how immensely rich they were. Your lordship cannot but be sensible that, at this present time, you stand indebted to sundry persons, to the value of *forty thousand pounds sterling.*"

"I have been told of a very singular expedient made use of by Mr. Peter Bøehler, one of the Brethren's Bishops, in order to strengthen the faith and to raise the drooping spirits of Mr. William Bell, who hath, unhappily, been drawn in, (with several others,) to be one of their agents. It was this. It being Mr. Bell's birth-day, he was sent for, from his house in Nevil's Alley, Fetter-Lane; but, for a while, having had some words with Mr. Bøehler, he refused to come. At length he complied; and was introduced into a Hall in the same Alley, where was placed an artificial mountain, which, upon singing a particular verse, was made to fall down; and then, behind it, was discovered an illumination, representing Jesus Christ and Mr. Bell, sitting very near, or embracing each other; and out of the clouds was also represented, plenty of money falling round Mr. Bell and the Saviour." . . . . Young Mr. Rhodes was prevailed on, (your lordship knows by whom,) about eighteen months ago, to sell his estate of above four hundred pounds a year, and went, or was sent off very lately, as I am assured, to France; leaving a destitute mother behind him, and only with twenty-five pounds; for the payment of which, he left his watch, bureau, horse, and saddle. These are but a few instances, my lord, amongst many, indeed, too, too many, that might be given. The Brethren's agents, and those concerned with them, can best tell what horrid *equivocations, untruths, and low artifices*, have been used to procure money, at high interest, whenever it was had, to keep up the Brethren's credit."\*

Now, it may well be asked, what reply did Count Zinzendorf offer to such charges as these, publicly made, and by such authority? Not one word. Lord Granville and others, urged the Count to prosecute Mr. Whitefield for libel, but he dare not, and did not do it. It is, perhaps, worth mentioning, that

---

\* Philip's Life and Times of George Whitefield, Ch. xxi. pp. 410-14.

Lord Granville, in 1752, sold to the Moravians one hundred thousand acres of land in North Carolina, for Moravian settlements ! whether this had anything to do with his zealous defense of Zinzendorf, Spangenberg does not tell us.\* With such a record before us, the story of Count Zinzendorf's miracles comes back to our recollection ; and we can well understand why Archbishop Potter should " have doubted, eventually, whether Zinzendorf was elected their Bishop ;" and why Bishop Lavington should have come to the conclusion, "*that the settlement of the Moravians in this kingdom seems to have been surreptitiously obtained.*"

We have not yet touched upon what must be regarded as certainly one of the very worst features of Moravianism. Its polity, policy, and ceremonialism, we have already adverted to. We mean, the practical Theology of Zinzendorf, and of the Moravians. The period of Zinzendorf's exile from Saxony, and especially the years 1742-50, has been called the "*sifting period.*" The historian, Kurtz, thus briefly sums up these horrible dogmas and practices. He says :—

"To this period belong, also, the greatest literary fruitfulness of the Count, together with the development of his peculiar theological views, modes of speech, and doctrines ; the composition and public use in worship of the notorious, later expelled, spiritual Hymns, with their indescribably foolish trifling, and their partly blasphemous, partly obscene, images and analogies ; further, the mountebank laudation of his society ; the not always honest proselytism ; the introduction and practice of a very questionable and shameless matrimonial discipline."†

A repetition of some of these Hymns, and a description of this matrimonial discipline, would be regarded, by every one of our readers, as too vile for our pages, and we shall not defile them by the transcription. But these Hymns, and this discipline, grew naturally out of the Theology of Zinzendorf ; and the principal points of his system, Kurtz thus states :—

"Among the numberless extravagances perpetrated by Zinzendorf and the Society, during the so-called *sifting-period*, which, however, Zinzendorf himself partly abandoned later, the following are the more remarkable and obnoxious.

\* Life of Count Zinzendorf, p. 417. † Kurtz's *Church History*, Vol. II. p. 257.

(1.) "The doctrine of the *maternal office*, of the Holy Ghost. Zinzendorf viewed the Holy Trinity as 'man, wife, and child.' ('Papa, mama, and their little flame, brother lampkin.') The Holy Ghost fills the position of mother, (God the Father's eternal wife, heart mama;) His maternal office is exercised in a three-fold way—at the eternal generation of the Son of God, at the conception of the man Jesus, at the regeneration of believers."

(2.) "The doctrine of the *paternal office* of Jesus Christ, (according to Isaiah ix. 6.) The creation of the world was accomplished, alone and exclusively by the Son, (the 'blessed potter,' according to Gen. ii. 7.); therefore, Christ is our special father—our direct father. The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is only 'what the world calls a father-in-law, a grand-father.'"

(3.) "Concerning the earthly life of our Saviour, Zinzendorf, in order to make prominent and clear the depth of his humiliation, loved to use the most disrespectful expressions, (journeyman carpenter, journeyman, he hung upon the Cross as a gallows-bird,") &c.

(4.) "He spoke equally disrespectfully, also, of the miserable fisherman's shepherd's and visitator stylo; of the classical obscurity, and rabbinical, shoulder-minology of the Holy Scriptures. *On the other hand, he pronounced his Society to be a living Bible.*"

(5.) "The *theory and practice of the marriage mystery*; (according to Eph. v. 32.) The Society, and every single soul in it, is the spiritual bride of Christ; and to make the intimate character of this relation clear, marriage-life is depicted, even to obscenity, and applied to the spiritual marriage with Christ, especially in the Hymns. But Christ is also the proper husband in corporeal matrimony. The begetting of children is a work of Christ, (belongs to his paternal office;) earthly husbands are only 'his procurators, in whose favor he has resigned it;' they are the vice-christs, vice men of the wives."\*

Other extracts, though the meaning is couched in the most decent language possible, are so gross, that we purposely omit them. We have already cited enough. Kurtz well says:—"He was personally persuaded of his divine calling; and as he was not accustomed to bow to the written Word of God, but interpreted it according to his subjective canon '*It appears so to me,*' and made only this, (together with the lot,) the rule of his life and labors," so he fell into these abominable and fanatical errors.

With these extracts we conclude our description of the interior life, the doctrines, and the practical workings of the System which Count Zinzendorf founded. We know that he afterwards abandoned, in part, many of the worst of these corruptions; and although it was during this "*sifting period,*"

---

\* Kurtz's Church History, Vol. II. pp. 260-1.



the period of these gross errors and abominations, that the Count made his journeys to America, where Moravian settlements were established, and congregations organized, some of which still exist, yet these communities, through various influences, have become freed from the monstrous features of the original Societies, and are doing their work quietly, and in a manner to deserve the respect of their Christian brethren. We need not say, the Missionary work of the Moravians challenges our admiration, and, in many respects, imitation. Yet the want of a fixed doctrinal basis, by which the Faith of the Society at large may be known and tested ; (Kurtz says, "freedom from all Creeds is a principle" with them ;) the presence of a mystic, and one-sided, emotional element, in their practical theory of the Christian Life ; certain peculiarities of Worship and Ceremony, such as love-feasts, feet-washings, and the fraternal kiss, &c., &c.,—all these must, of necessity, come into the question, whenever that question shall be raised, of their formal recognition by us as a Branch of the Catholic Church of Christ. Strictly on the ground of principle, we have yet to see the first intimation that they desire any such recognition. Our money, in aid of their Missions, they are quite ready to receive. Our implied admission of the extraordinary spirituality of these seraphic little *ecclesiolæ*, would not, we presume, be particularly ungrateful to them. It is time there was an end to such sentimentality ; and that we come down a little to the line of common life, common sense, and common duty. With the wonderful opportunities which God is now opening to the Church, at home and abroad, with the new life and zeal everywhere apparent among us, and which needs to be stimulated and encouraged with every possible incentive, and with the imperative claims of our half-starved, self-sacrificing, noble missionary band,—we certainly have a call for all our combined energies, for some time to come. To tire of, and neglect, duties that are real, imperative and pressing, because they are common ; and to chase perpetually after what is fanciful and visionary, because it has the charm of novelty, is a marked characteristic of modern charity. It is sensational, noisy and conceited ; a thing of platforms, and newspapers, and the corners of the streets. It is spurious, and lacks true



discernment and sound wisdom. The Kingdom of God cometh not with such observation. The severity of John Randolph's sarcasm,—“the Greeks are at your own door, Madam,” lay in its truth.

There remains to be considered, the important question of the Moravian Episcopacy,—its origin and validity. On that point, and in conclusion, we now give the important paper to which we have already alluded :—

#### ON THE EPISCOPACY OF THE MORAVIANS.\*

The claim of any body of Christians to be considered a true branch of the Church of Christ, must at all times be a matter of deep interest to those who desire to see all who are called by the name of Christ, “continuing in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in the (consequently acceptable) breaking of bread and in prayers.”—Acts ii. 42. When, therefore, among the numerous bodies which are in a state of separation from the Apostolical Church in England, one is found which claims, equally with that Church, the possession of the Apostolic commission, it cannot be wondered at, that when that claim is brought forward, as in one or two cases it lately has been, it should excite the attention of the members of the Church, and lead them to inquire into the nature of it. And as the desire of all must be, to see the wounds in Christ’s body healed, rather than torn more widely open, it would be with a wish to find that claim established, that the inquiry would be made. For so would there be more reasonable hope, that, in God’s good time, the division would cease.

It was with these feelings and in this desire, that the writer of these remarks commenced his inquiry, (the result of which is now submitted to the reader,) into the claims of the Moravians (so-called) to be considered an Episcopal, i. e., an Apostolical branch of the Church of Christ. Into the state of religion among them, either as it was, or as it is, he has no intention to enter; the former he is unwilling, the latter he is unqualified, to discuss. He proposes, therefore, to limit the inquiry to the grounds on which they rest their claim to the possession of the Apostolic commission, which they assert has legitimately descended to them, by Episcopal Succession. For this purpose it will be necessary to give a slight sketch of some features of Ecclesiastical history, connected with them.

Moravia and Bohemia were converted to the Christian faith, in the ninth century, by the preaching of Cyril and Methodius, two Greek Ecclesiastics, who introduced the rites and customs of their own (Greek) Church, which were retained, without interruption, until the time of Otho the First, towards the close of the tenth century, who

---

\* The following paper, by the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, was first published in the *British Magazine*, of 1836; was re-printed, with additions, in the *Leeds Christian Miscellany*, in 1842; and was issued in pamphlet form, in London, in 1843.

began to endeavor to bring the Moravians under the Papal yoke. This attempt was followed up, with more or less success, by succeeding Emperors, and their own Princes, till about the middle of the fourteenth century, when the general adoption of all the corruptions and abuses of the western Church was enforced, and the Latin language and Popish ceremonies introduced into the Churches, the marriage of the Clergy prohibited, and the use of the cup in the Eucharist denied to the people. This was not effected without strenuous opposition on the part of individuals, and numerous bodies of the people, of all ranks. Among the eminent individuals who, from time to time, arose to witness against the Papal usurpations and corruptions, the celebrated John Huss occupies the most conspicuous place, who, in 1415, sealed his testimony with his blood, being burned alive at Constance, in violation of the Emperor's safe conduct.

His followers were divided into two parties: 1st *Calixtines*, so-called, because the chief point on which they insisted in their differences with Rome, was the use of the cup (*Calix*) for the people in the Eucharist. 2d. *Taborites*, so-called, from the tents (*Tabor*) in which they dwelt, which name they gave to the mountain on which they held their religious assemblies. These last were strenuous in opposing *all* the Papal additions to Christian doctrines; and, not content with this, sought to propagate their views by the use of the sword. This naturally drew upon them the wrath of the government, and after a long and cruel war, they were at length dispersed and subjected to severe persecutions. The remnant which survived were at length permitted to settle at Lititz, in the borders of Silesia and Moravia, in the year 1451. Having no Clergy of their own, they were, for a time, supplied by some who were sent to them from the Calixtines. In 1457, they formed themselves into a community, entitled *Unitas Fratrum*, or the *United Brethren*: and in 1467, determining to be wholly independent, both of the Romish party, whom they hated, and of the Calixtines, whom they despised, they sent some Presbyters of their number, who had come over to them from the Calixtines and the Romanists, to receive what they call Episcopal Orders, from an individual who is styled Stephen, Bishop of the Waldenses in Austria. From this time, it is said, they religiously preserved the Episcopal Order among them, having generally one Bishop in Poland, another in Bohemia, and two in Moravia. In process of time their congregations were dispersed and broken up, the number of their Bishops was not kept up; and in the year 1710, only two individuals professing to have received that Order survived: one of whom was Dr. Daniel Jablonsky, chaplain to the King of Prussia: the other, named Sitkovius, resided in Poland. Both these were seniors of the *Polish* branch of the *United Brethren*. It is from Jablonsky, with the approval of Sitkovius, that the Moravians, (so-called,) of the present day, profess to have received Episcopal Orders. Let us state the origin of this body. In the year 1722, Count Zinzendorf, a Polish nobleman, formed an establishment on his estate of a number of individuals, of different religious persuasions, at a place called Herrnbut. Among these were some emigrants from Bohemia and *Moravia*, who, having been brought up in the Church of Rome, had seen reason to

abandon its tenets. The settlements increased by the accession of individuals from different quarters; and in 1727, it consisted of about three hundred persons, one half of whom are stated to have been Bohemian or Moravian emigrants.

Up to the year 1735, they had *no Clergy of their own*, and availed themselves of the ministrations of the Lutheran pastor of the parish, at whose hands they received the Holy Sacrament; and great efforts were made, on the part of Count Zinzendorf, who was himself a Lutheran, and by other Lutheran members of the community, to bring the establishment into entire connection with the Lutherans. This, however, was overruled, and the desire to be "independent" led them first, to institute among themselves a sort of lay or congregational orders; and then, to apply to Dr. Jablonsky, with the concurrence of Sitkovius, to give them, as they say, Episcopal Orders, for which purpose they selected David Nitschmann, who is said to have been consecrated Bishop by Jablonsky, in the month of March, 1735; and from these two, the Episcopal Succession is declared to have been preserved up to the present time, when there are stated to be thirteen Bishops,—six in Germany, two in England, one in Ireland, one in Asia, and three in America. Such is the account furnished by their historians, Regenvolch (*History of the Slavonic Churches*, 1662;) the *Acta Fratrum Unitatis*, 1749; Crantz (*History of the Brethren*;) Holmes (*History of the Brethren*, 1830;) and Bost (*History of the Brethren*, 1834.)

Into the accuracy of these facts, it is necessary for us to inquire. And before we can be reasonably called upon to acknowledge the genuine Episcopacy of the Moravians, Herrnhuters, or United Brethren, (by all which names they are known,) it is clearly necessary that we should have reasonable ground for believing,—1st. That the Waldenses, from whom it is said that the original Taborites, or United Brethren, received Episcopal consecration, were themselves really possessed of Episcopacy. 2d. That the individual, Stephen, a member of the Waldensian community, to whom the Taborites are said to have applied for this purpose, was himself a Bishop. 3d. That the Taborites, or United Brethren, did really seek and receive from him, Episcopal consecration. 4th. That supposing them to have received Episcopal consecration at the time stated, they were careful to preserve it, so that Dr. Jablonsky should be regarded by others, and not by himself only, as a real Bishop. 5th. That the Herrnhuters did actually apply for and receive Episcopal consecration from him. 6th. That supposing them to have done so, they have since been careful to preserve it amongst them. It will be clear, upon consideration, that a failure in reasonable proof on any of these points, must be fatal to the reasonableness of their claim upon us for recognition: unfortunately, it will be found that on all these points, save one, this failure exists.

For, I. There is no point of Ecclesiastical history involved in such extreme doubt and difficulty, as whether the ancient Waldenses were or were not possessed of genuine Episcopacy. On the one hand, we have the accusations of the other Christians who surrounded them, charging them with being without valid Orders, and allowing Laymen to administer the Eucharist. (See Alan and Pylicdorf, cited by Bos-

suet, iii, 455, 457.) And the opinion of Peter Waldo, an eminent member of their community, to the effect that "the orders of the presbytery were one of the marks of the beast of the Apocalypse." (See Leger's History, i. 156.) On the other hand, we have the account of Reinerius, "that they had always amongst them some chief pastor, endowed with the authority of a Bishop, with two coadjutors, one of whom he called his eldest son, the other his younger; and that besides these, he had a third, who assisted him in the quality of deacon." And "that the Bishop ordained other pastors by imposition of hands." But their historian, Leger, who cites this testimony of Reinerius, declares the whole account to be a mere fiction, and that all their histories, chronicles, and works, declare plainly that the thing was altogether different. (Leger, i. 199.) But then it is to be considered, that when Leger wrote his history, they were certainly Presbyterians,—for in 1630, all their pastors except two, had been swept off by the plague; and they received supplies of ministers from the Presbyterian Calvinists of France and Switzerland.

II. The Episcopal character of the individual, Stephen, in Austria, is open to grave objection; as the earliest histories of the Taborites, Moravians, or Brethren, which I have yet met with, make no mention of him as such. These histories I find in a collection published by Louis Camerarius, in the year 1605,—one written by his father, Joachim, about 1575, the other by the seniors and ministers of the Church of the Brethren, in the year 1572. In neither of these histories is the name of Stephen mentioned. The first account that I have met with of the Episcopal character of the heads of the Waldenses, in Austria, is in the History of the Slavonic Churches, by Regenvolsch, of the date of 1652; for which he refers to an account of the United Brethren, published in 1609.

III. That there was a communication made between the Taborites, or United Brethren, of Moravia, and the Waldenses, and a mission from the former to the latter, in 1467, is stated by all the historians. But that the mission was for the purpose of obtaining consecration, the earlier historians have not a word. The account of the matter published by the seniors and ministers of the Brethren themselves, in 1572, represents the mission to have been for the sole purpose of inquiring into the doctrines of the Waldenses; whose conduct, upon examination, they considered so scandalous, that they could not, with a safe conscience, join with them. As the book is scarce, the reader may be interested in having the account.

"About the commencement of our Churches, (1467,) there were some Churches of the Waldenses in the countries near to Bohemia, especially in Austria, and in Marchia; but as these, being oppressed by Papal tyranny, had no public assemblies, nor any of their writings were extant, they were altogether unknown to our people. Therefore, when they made themselves known to ours, and inquiries were made of us by others concerning them, it came to pass, that at the time aforesaid, legates were sent by us to the Waldenses, who might take knowledge of their doctrine, what it was. [Of this, he says, he could give no clear account, and adds:] But this we can show, that they never united to our Churches, nor our people ever wished to join them;

and this on two accounts, as our annals testify: first, our people were offended with the Waldenses, because they were unwilling that any public testimonies of their doctrine and faith should exist, and thus seemed to hide the truth, and to place their light under a bushel: secondly, because, for the sake of peace and tranquillity, they made use of the Popish mass, which, at the same time, they knew and professed to consider to be idolatrous; and thus acting, in collusion with the Papists, were a scandal to others. On these two accounts, not only did our people never join themselves to them, but always considered that they could not do so with a safe conscience."

Joachim Camerarius' account, in 1575, is as follows:

"It was the year of Christ, 1467, when the Brethren first began to have, from among their own company, persons to exercise doctrine and defend discipline, who at first were three, chosen by lot, by whom the rest, as need might be, should be ordained. About that time they heard that there was a certain congregation of ancient Waldenses in the places near to Austria, presided over by learned and pious men, and in which the evangelical discipline flourished, and the dignity and authority of the Priesthood were preserved. Thither two of the Brethren are sent, to acquaint their two Seniors and their congregation with the cause and beginning of their separation from the Papal Church, and the manner of their administration, stating faithfully all things that had happened; and requiring on all points the sentence and judgment of the Waldenses. A few of these were in Bohemia, skulking, through fear of their adversaries, with which they were excessively agitated. To them came the emissaries of the Brethren, and laid before them their affairs and accounts. All things were approved of by them, who professed singular joy at the knowledge of the piety and religion of the Brethren, and affirmed that the things that were done by them, were agreeable to the institution and administration of Christ and the Apostles, and right in themselves: to which they added an exhortation to them, strenuously to pursue the way of the truth of heavenly doctrine, and of discipline agreeable thereto, which they had entered. And they laid their hands on them, blessing them after the manner of the Apostles, for the sake of confirming their minds, and in token of fellowship and agreement."

To this he adds the account of a second mission from the Brethren to the Waldenses, to propose an union between them, on condition of the Waldenses amending the two points of objection mentioned in the first extract, and some others,—a proposal which fell to the ground, through the timidity of the Waldenses. Now here we certainly have an account of imposition of hands by the Waldenses upon the two deputies of the Brethren; but the cause distinctly stated to be, in token of fellowship and agreement, and for the confirming their minds: of any idea of consecration not a whisper.

Regenvolsch, in his account, for which he refers to an earlier one, of the date of 1609, says, that the election of three pastors from among the Brethren, was done by the advice of the Waldenses who were settled in Austria, with two of their Bishops: and after describing the progress of election by lot, he goes on to observe:—

"But these three were not as yet ordained and confirmed to the ministry in that Synod: only their election took place. *They knew, indeed, that nothing was wanting to their inauguration as ministers: that, according to the institution of Christ and the example of the Apostles, they could be lawfully ordained and initiated in the sacred things, by other presbyters or pastors of the Church, whom the sacred Scripture does not distinguish from Bishops, but speaks of them all by the same name. They found that the superiority of the Bishops, and assigning to them alone the power of ordaining other ministers of the word, was not of old introduced by divine right or command or Apostolic authority, and the law of necessity, that it could not otherwise be,—but by human institution and appointment of Ecclesiastical polity, arising from certain occasions.*" (In proof of which, and to show that this was done after the time of the Apostles, he misquotes Jerome, who expressly says it was done in the time spoken of by St. Paul, in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians: and then adds,) "Nevertheless, to meet in every way the calumnies of their adversaries, especially at the commencement of that reformation, they thought it right, that, as far as possible, they should observe the same themselves. And whereas the aforesaid Waldenses affirmed that they had lawful Bishops, and a lawful and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles; they, in a solemn rite, created Bishops of three of the ministers of the Brethren, who had been already elsewhere ordained; and conferred on them the power of ordination."

He specifies the three to be, two Romish priests, and one Waldensian priest, who had come over to them.

It is speaking mildly to affirm, that these incongruous accounts present very great difficulty in arriving at the truth of the story.

IV. We come to inquire into the grounds for believing that the Episcopacy, thus alleged to have been obtained by the United Brethren, in 1467, was carefully preserved among them, so that Jablonsky, the last of their chiefs, from whom the Herrnhuters are stated to have received Episcopacy, in 1735, should be regarded as a genuine Bishop.

Here, first, we are met by this difficulty, namely, that Regenvolsch, in the very next sentence to that last quoted from him, goes on to say, that the three individuals, affirmed by him to have been consecrated Bishops, rejected that title, on account of the abuse of it among their adversaries; and for the sake of avoiding hatred and envy: and chose rather to be called seniors, which, he says, continued to this time: it being hard to conceive that men should have been careful to preserve that, the name of which they shrank from owning.

Secondly, we are informed by all their historians, that in the year 1570, so entire a union was found between the United Brethren, the Calvinists, and the Lutherans, in Poland, that they formed but one Church; and adopted from the Calvinists the idea of having a lay elder, associated with a clerical elder, in every district. It is from and through this, the Polish community united and amalgamated with the Presbyterian Calvinists and Lutherans, so as to be one body with them, that we are required to believe that Jablonsky and Sitkovius received genuine Episcopacy.



But what places the matter apparently beyond all doubt, is the account which is given in Camerarius' book,—in the whole of which not a whisper of their Episcopacy is to be found,—of the different orders of Clergy among the Brethren; which is as follows:—

“The Clergy at this day among the Brethren is divided into *three* degrees,—Acolyths, Deacons, and Ministers. (1.) The name of Acolyth is given to those who, after they have applied their minds to sacred things, learn the first rudiments of theology, as the Catechism, remarkable texts of Scripture, holy Songs, &c. Their office is constantly to wait upon and serve the Ministers, that they may be not only spectators of their life and manners, but witnesses thereof to the people. If any of them make laudable progress, it is sometimes allowed to them to have prayers with the people, to baptize, and administer the like things. (2.) The Deacons discharge nearly all the offices of the Ministers, excepting the administration of the first part of the Eucharist. They have prayers with the people; they confirm marriages, &c. And out of these, the Ministers are created, after the following manner: (3.) As often as the Seniors please, and necessity requires that the number of Ministers should be increased, in the first place, the Seniors or presidents visit carefully all the Churches committed to their charge, and make diligent inquiry into the life, manners, and doctrine of those who are reported by the pastors or by the people to be fittest for this ordination. If the honesty of their life agrees with the purity of their doctrine, they are commended. If otherwise, and any obstacle presents itself, they are put off for a time. Some weeks after the visitation, a Synod is convened, at which, as well all the Pastors as the Deacons, and especially those to be inaugurated, are compelled to appear. . . . On the second day, the Seniors make a list of the candidates, and give it to the whole college of Ministers for their judgment, to approve or reject, as they may see fit. When their opinions have been collected, and a mark affixed to those who, from whatever cause, are counted unworthy, the Seniors call the candidates to them in order; make examination of their religious opinions; give them advice concerning the importance and dignity of the Ministry, &c. The next day they go to Church, and prayers and sermon being ended, the candidates are called over by the President, and made to stand forth in the midst, and answer publicly to the questions proposed to them; which, being done, they are commended to God by the prayers of the congregation, and the chief President confirms them by imposition of hands. The whole affair is ended by the Communion.”

In like manner, Regenvolsch, p. 63, classes all their Clergy under *three* heads, Acolyths, Deacons, and Ministers.

Thus far, clearly, we have only *three* orders of the Clergy, and only *one* of these competent to celebrate the Eucharist,—the other two, Deacons and Acolyths, being inferior to this. Hence the reasonable inference is, that the Seniors or Superintendents were only *primi inter pares*, advanced in dignity, but not in degree or order, above the pastors or Ministers. Nor does the account furnished by the memorabilia of John Lasitius, concerning the discipline of the Churches of the



Brethren, written about 1580, and republished by Comenius in 1660, lead us, upon consideration, to any other conclusion; though at first he would seem to speak of five or six orders. The following extracts contain the chief of his information upon this subject.

CHAPTER III. *Of the degrees and order of Ministers in the Church of the Brethren, and of the Offices of Bishops.*

The Brethren have, in their congregation, Presbyters, who in Latin are Seniors, and Ministers, Deacons, Acolyths inferior to these in degree.—2. All these are Clergy, i. e., persons dedicated and consecrated to the Ministry of the Church. 10. The name of Bishops is known from the Apostolic writings, taken from the Greek overseeing, which is their office, to oversee and take cognizance of the life, faith, and morals of the flock committed to them by Christ. 11. Which thing ours do, although they are very seldom so called, choosing rather to be, than to be called Bishops.—12. Their more common appellation is that of Seniors; he who is a Pastor, the same is also a Minister. A Deacon is somewhat less than this. An Acolyth is a companion of the Seniors, and a witness of their life. 13. The care of the whole Church is not entrusted to one, but to four Bishops united, who are as one. 29. When any Senior dies, it is the office of the Bishop to ordain another, but according to the suffrage of the Pastors assembled in Synod. 31. It is his office, likewise, to choose fit persons into the number of Acolyths, Deacons, and Ministers.

CHAPTER IV. The method observed in electing and ordaining Conseniors, is the same as is used in respect of Bishops.

CHAPTER XIV. 13. It may be desirable to relate what are the degrees, and what the means for attaining the chief Ministry among the brethren. 14. First, one of the Seniors makes an address to the *Acolyths*; then the youths who have been recommended to the Seniors by the Ministers, are called in order, and bound by the Bishop under their hand, *stipulata manu*: by certain questions relating to future disciplines, they learn the duties assigned to them, and are reckoned among the number of the Acolyths. 15. Then another address is made concerning the degree and office of *Deacons*; which being ended, those of the Acolyths who are found fit for the purpose, are called forth in the midst, are bound to it by certain promises, are confirmed by prayers to God, and are taught what they ought to do. 16. Then follows an address of the Bishop to the *Ministers*, the Deacons being present part of the time, the rest to the Ministers alone.

CHAPTER XV. *The manner of ordaining Ministers, and Conseniors, and Seniors.*

The inauguration of *Ministers* (superior to Deacons, for the brethren distinguish the offices) is performed in this manner. The Deacons whose testimonials of life and qualifications are approved of by the Ministers and Conseniors, are brought to a public Assembly, and after prayers and sermon, and questions made and answered, the Bishop ordains, consecrates, and dedicates them to God, after the ancient rite of the Church, they kneeling before him, and he, with two or three

others of the Seniors, laying hands upon them. . . . The election of *Seniors* is as follows. In an assembly, the need of increasing the number is stated; then every Minister states whom he thinks fit for the offices, and declares the same in writing to the Seniors. These, approving of those who have the greater number of votes, write down the names of the chosen; and consecrate them, by the Bishop, *in almost the same order as the Ministers.* (*Eodem ferme quo et ministros ordine per episcopum consecrant.*)

Nor is the creation of *Bishops* themselves different from these. They, who of the Seniors or *Conseniors* are chosen in a like manner by all the Ministers and Seniors, and called into the presence of the Church,—promise that they will be faithful in all things; and then all, in turn, promise to obey them.

Here we have Acolyths, Deacons, Ministers, Conseniors, Seniors, and Bishops: and at first sight, apparently, separate ordinations for them all. But as it appears from Chapter IV., that the appointment of Consenior is after the *same* method as that of Senior, and as it appears from Chapter XV., that the appointment of Senior is after the *same* manner as that of Minister, and that of Bishop *not otherwise*,—it seems, at least, reasonable to conclude, that the terms, Minister, Consenior, Senior, and Bishop, did but express different offices of one order, as among us the offices of Vicar, Rector, Rural-Dean, and Archdeacon, (to say nothing of Prebendary, Canon, and Cathedral-dean,) are all held by Clergy of one order, even Presbyters. There seems little reason to think that their Superintendents differed in any material respect from the Superintendents or Seniors of the Lutherans, which office the Calvinists in Poland had likewise. Indeed, their historian, Crantz, distinctly informs us that it was only in their intercourse with Protestant Episcopal Churches, that they made use of the Episcopal title. Crantz, p. 54. And whether we suppose or not, that the story of the Waldensian consecration, and of their having genuine Episcopacy, (on which their earliest accounts extant are silent,) was invented for the sake of influencing Episcopal communication or not, yet none can shut their eyes to the extreme difficulty which their confused, and apparently contradictory accounts, place in the way of our acknowledgment of their claim.

Certain it is, that so little was their Episcopal character known or regarded on the continent, that when, in 1695, the learned Grabe was about to go over from the Lutherans to the Papists, simply from a desire of obtaining valid ordination, his friend Spener dissuaded him, and showed him where he might obtain it without Papal corruptions, directing him, not to the Seniors or Superintendents of the Brethren, though near at hand, but to England. And yet Grabe was an intimate friend of Jablonsky, the last Superintendent or Senior of the United Brethren; and who undoubtedly believed that he possessed the genuine Episcopal character, and set great store by it. So in 1711, we find Jablonsky himself mentioning the fact, that several candidates for the Ministry had gone over to England for that very account, namely, to receive valid ordination, without Popery: a work of supererogation, if Jablonsky's Episcopal character had been known

and allowed. And again, there was at that time an active correspondence between the courts of Berlin and St. James with a view to obtaining Episcopal consecrations for Prussia. But what need of such a correspondence, if the Episcopacy of Jablonsky, who was the king of Prussia's own chaplain, had been acknowledged?

V. There appears no reason to question the alleged fact, that in 1735 the Herrnhuters did present David Nitschmann to Dr. Jablonsky, to be consecrated or ordained by him a Senior and President of their community; and Jablonsky did perform some such office upon him.

VI. As to whether they have been careful, since, to preserve and hand down that Episcopacy which they are stated then to have received, is not so clear. In the first place, none of their writers exhibit any succession of consecrations beyond a few at the first: secondly, they are so lax in their way of speaking, as to call a man consecrated by another, if he merely signs his letters of orders. (Compare their folio volume, p. 115, with Holmes' history, I., 226, 241.) 3: They openly declare, in their Exposition of Christian Doctrine, (p. 429) that they consider Episcopacy to be a departure from primitive simplicity. 4. In point of practice, they acknowledge the equal validity of Presbyterian or Congregational ordination with Episcopalian. "Hence, when a Minister joins their Church, who has previously received ordination in any other Church, he is allowed to exercise the functions of the Ministry, without being re-ordained by their Bishops." Holmes' Hist. I., p. 228.

Still they profess now to have among themselves three orders, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; their form of ordination is as follows:—

#### ORDINATIONS.

*The service being opened by the singing of the hymn, "Come, Holy Ghost; Come, Lord, our God," &c., or some other suitable verses, the Bishop addresses the congregation in an appropriate discourse, ending with a charge to the candidate for ordination; after which he offers up a prayer, imploring the blessing of God upon the solemn transaction, and commending the candidate to His grace, that he may be endowed with power and unction, and the influences of the Holy Ghost, for preaching the word of God, administering the Holy Sacraments, and for doing all those things which shall be committed unto him, for the promotion of the spiritual edification of the Church. The Bishop then proceeds to ordain the candidate with imposition of hands, pronouncing the following or similar words:*

I ordain (consecrate) thee, N. N. to be a Deacon (Presbyter) (*Bishop*) of the Church of the United Brethren, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; The Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace: in the Name of Jesus. Amen.

*The Bishop having returned to his place, kneels down with the whole congregation, all worshipping in silent devotion; while one of the fol-*

*lowing doxologies is sung by the choir, the congregation joining in the Amen. HALLELUJAH.*

*The service is concluded with a short hymn: and the Bishop's pronouncing the New Testament blessing.*

*(N. B. At the consecration of the Bishops, three, or at least two, Bishops are required to assist.)*

Such are the difficulties which lie in the way of the recognition of their claim,—the first four (apparently) insuperable. 1. It seems impossible to establish, upon reasonable certainty, the Episcopalian character of the Waldenses: 2. No reasonable ground is offered for believing that the wandering party of that denomination in Austria, had Bishops among them,—no writer being alleged as affirming it, till one hundred and forty years after their utter extinction. 3. There is every reason to disbelieve the account of the United Brethren having sought consecration from the Waldenses as alleged, in 1467. How can one believe that men who counted those Waldenses a scandal to the Christian name, for their (as they thought) base compliances with Papal corruption, and who themselves accounted Episcopacy to be a corruption of Scriptural and Apostolic and primitive custom, and accounted Presbyterian organization agreeable to all these tests,—should themselves have sought, at the hands of these Waldenses, a participation in such corruption; and that after having thus, through deference to the Papists, laid the foundation of their community in corruption, they should, out of regard to the same Papists, immediately have hidden their acquisition, and forbore to claim the Episcopal character, which they had compromised so much principle to obtain,—these men being the Taborites, the most open and reckless of all the adversaries which the corruptions of Rome have ever stirred up against her,—or how account for the utter silence of their earlier historians upon the subject? I do not say the thing is impossible, but that in all points it is so contrary to probability, as to be void of all reasonable claim upon our credence. 4. It is, if possible, still more difficult to believe, that a community of Christians, of whose Episcopacy, from the time of their first institution, for one hundred and forty years, no whisper, as far as appears, had reached the world; who during that time had formed one body, having mutual communion, and common Seniors with other religious communities known to be Presbyterians, could have had, or retained true Episcopacy. So that there seems no other conclusion at which to arrive, than that the claim of the Herrnhuters, Moravians, or United Brethren, to have their Episcopacy recognized by us as genuine, is destitute of any reasonable foundation.

But, it will be said, what do you make of the recognition of their Episcopal character, which they have at different times obtained from some of the English Prelates? One can only say, that unless those Prelates had other documents, which we have not,—which there appears no reason to believe,—we are as competent judges of the facts as they were. Possibly they knew only the accounts of Regenvolsch and Comenius, and had not noted the totally different accounts to be found in the earlier histories and documents collected and published by Came-

rarius. As to the recognition obtained of Archbishop Potter and the British Parliament, in the middle of the last century, through the exertions of Zinzendorf, the leader of their body,—it was obtained on the strength of a collection of papers, most of which, and a list of them all, we have now in print, in the well-known folio volume: than which, according to the accounts of those who carefully examined into the matter, a grosser mass of imposition was never palmed upon the public. The following extract from Rimius' "Animadversions on sundry flagrant untruths advanced by Mr. Zinzendorf," p. 15, bears upon the point before us.

"A world of arguments and facts having been brought against Mr. Zinzendorf by several authors, to prove from history, from the nature of the thing itself, and from his own and his people's printed confession, that the pretended Episcopal Succession he boasts of is a mere phantom or, *ens rationis*; instead of refuting these arguments and facts, we find the following remarkable answer, contrived between him and Mr. Spangenberg.

#### Mr. Spangenberg's Query.

'How is it with the Episcopal Succession? Some adversaries say, that it is only an invention of the Brethren.'

#### Mr. Zinzendorf's answer hereupon.

'This invention, the old Bohemian, Moravian, Polonian and English Bishops should be charged with, and not us. For we were not then present; *relata referimus*."

In Rimius' "Supplement to the Candid Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Herrnhuters," (p. xxxi.) we have the following note on the same point:

"Notwithstanding Mr. Zinzendorf has had the assurance, by his deputies, to make an honorable Parliament believe, that there is a Moravian Brethren Church subsisting at Lissa, in Poland, it is *notorious* that it is a *Presbyterian one*, and that those Moravians and Bohemians who escaped the cruelties of the war in 1620, and the following years, incorporated in it. Moreover, a *Polish Nobleman*, a Protestant residing in London, whose father in a manner has protected these Calvinists, reports of them, 'that all their Ministers are on an equal footing: that the oldest of them, without having respect to the importance of his cure, is always chosen a Senior or Elder, for the sake of performing ordination; that he is nothing else but *primus inter pares*, having not the least jurisdiction or authority over the other Clergy; and that he never heard there a Minister presume to give himself out for a Bishop, which, besides, was inconsistent with the Polish constitution.' But what need have I of foreign testimony, as Mr. Zinzendorf, in the above act of acception of the high office conferred on him, speaking of these Presbyterians in Poland, himself tells his Brethren that they are Calvinists, and that the *title of Senior* (which the oldest of their Ministers bears) *neither implies, nor can imply, nor is that of Bishop*. Creutzreich, p. 223. *It is to be observed, that this passage*

*likewise has been left out by him in the abstract of the act of acceptance laid before the Parliament."*

Jablonsky and Sitkovius, from whom Zinzendorf claimed to have received consecration,—from the former by imposition of hands, from the latter by signing his letters of orders,—were Seniors of this Polish community. Concerning their claims generally, the conclusion to which one of our Bishops, after a careful examination and attempt at verification of their documents, arrived, was this, that "*the settlement of the Moravians in these kingdoms, seems to have been surreptitiously obtained.*" See Bishop Lavington's "Moravians compared and detected," preface, p. xiv. : and no wonder : when the University of Tübingen, a testimonial from whom, dated 1733, appears in the folio volume, p. 22, among those presented to Parliament, in answer to Bishop Lavington's inquiries, returned him a letter explaining that the testimonial of 1733 had been obtained under false impressions, *and that a very contrary act had subsequently been taken by the University, of which Zinzendorf had said nothing.* They conclude as follows :

"We cannot in any wise believe that the illustrious Parliament of England hath, by its act, received into the bosom of the English Church, the Zinzendorfsians, but to have solely indulged it a civil toleration, like that of the Quakers. May God Almighty preserve the English Church, that most noble Body of the Protestant Church, against this cancer, which spreads by little and little." Dated at Tübingen, 1755.

Among other testimonials, Zinzendorf had produced one from the Dean and Faculty of Divines at Copenhagen : in Rimius' Collection we have the following from that body.

"We have been informed that Count Zinzendorf boasts, in Germany, that he has been examined, in the month of May, 1735, by the Theological Faculty at Copenhagen, and has obtained testimonials of orthodoxy ; and we are asked, whether these things are so or not ? Wherefore, *as such testimonials have never been given, nor any examination set on foot, nor we, to our knowledge, have ever been petitioned that the same might be undertaken;* and whereas Count Stolberg has desired that we might attest this in a public and legal manner,—we have thought it to be our duty in no manner to dissimulate, but rather, on the faith of a public certificate, to own the truth. Copenhagen, April 8, 1747." Thus much may suffice to show the degree of credit that was really due to the allegations of these men at the time ; and by consequence the little value to be set upon a recognition obtained by such means.

There is no need to say more upon the subject ; all that the writer purposed was, to inquire into the facts of the case, and to lay the result of his inquiries before the world. This he has now done. Different persons will perhaps arrive at different conclusions. But he does not see how it can be deemed otherwise than reasonable to consider, that the claims of the Moravians, Herrnhuters, or United Brethren, are not so supported, as to entitle them to recognition by the Catholic Church.



## ART. V.—RT. REV. THOMAS C. BROWNELL, D. D., LL. D.

WHEN one who has lived long and lived well, has passed from among us, "as a shock of corn fully ripe when it cometh in its season," and his life lies before us, a finished thing, in its completeness and its symmetry, we contemplate it rather with a calm pleasure and satisfaction than with grief and mourning,—gratitude is more suitable than lamentation, congratulation than regret. A new treasure is added to the Church's wealth of blessed memories; a new name is enrolled upon the list of those whose faith we are to follow, considering the end of their conversation; and we bless God for the good example of another who, having finished his course in faith, does now rest from his labors. Such, we believe, are the feelings with which the whole Church, and especially his own Diocese, and those, most of all, who enjoyed the privilege of knowing him well, regard the demise of the late venerable Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We do not write his life; that is left to other and fitter hands; but we gladly bring our tribute to add something, if we may, to the sweetness of his fragrant memory.

"Who is a wise man," asks St. James, "and endued with knowledge among you? Let him show out of a good conversation his works, with meekness of wisdom." The words are at once an epitome of Bishop Brownell's history, and a summary of his character. The meekness of wisdom,—perhaps there are no words that would more aptly and accurately describe just that combination of qualities that made him what he was, and marked him as a man among men,—a wisdom that was always meek, and a meekness that was always wise. A wisdom there is that is arrogant, contentious, and overbearing, but that was not *his* wisdom; and there is a meekness that is childish, pliable, and servile, but that was not *his* meekness. His was the meekness of wisdom. Let us look a little at this rather rare admixture of qualities, and the somewhat uncom-



mon form of character which is its result. Perhaps, in so doing, we shall get an indirect but real picture of the man. Like the Divine Master, "he did not strive, nor cry, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets," but his were those "words of wise men which are heard in quiet, more than the cry of him that ruleth among fools." In this lay the quiet, but effective strength of his life; seen in its results, more than noticed in its working.

Yet the combination of qualities expressed in the phrase, though rarely seen in any such close and harmonious blending as to make a beautiful and consistent whole, is not the least forced or unnatural. The two things draw together and unite by an inward affinity. Each is the proper complement of the other; and neither can exist in any just development and perfection without the presence of its companion. A man who is not meek, is not wise in the best sense; and meekness without wisdom is a thing without dignity or worth. A truly intelligent, enlightened, and judicious man will show his wisdom in an unassuming modesty, and a peaceful forbearance. Noisy, positive, assuming, denunciatory assertion of knowledge and opinion, is not true wisdom. "The wisdom that cometh from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits." True wisdom is quiet, modest, tolerant, considerate, "patient towards all men," "in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves," averse to clamor and publicity, exhibiting in all it does the opposite of whatsoever is harsh, proud, unkind, uncivil, overbearing, or resentful. If rich stores of knowledge and of counsel are clothed in such a garb, shining through it like golden treasures in a network of silver, with a lustre that seeks not to shine, but shines because to shine is its nature, men will love and venerate them far more readily and generously than if they had sought to attract their praise by ostentatious arts and assiduous endeavors. Meekness is equanimity, charity, and gentleness, united. And when these are underlaid by wisdom, which is knowledge, judgment, and practical tact, combined, and the grace of God is in them, mingling with them a living faith in the Redeemer, and the hope that elevates the soul

above what is low and grovelling in human life, a style of character is produced, which, in its perfection, is indeed never seen in the world, but in such approximations to it as sometimes meet our observation, calls forth our reverence and our gratitude, leading us to thank God for what we see, and would fain resemble.

That such an approximation, in a remarkable degree, there was in the late Bishop of Connecticut, those who knew him will not think extravagant praise. Under his benign administration, the Diocese over which he presided for almost half a century, enjoyed uninterrupted harmony and tranquillity, and has been favored with a steady, healthful, and vigorous growth. There have been Bishops that were more active and energetic, that carried prerogative higher, that more strenuously maintained and urged their own views and opinions, that put up their Clergy to more varied and exhaustive labors; but there are few that, by a gentle, steady, imperceptible pressure, have done so much to stamp themselves upon their charge, to leave behind them a deep and indelible impression of their influence, and to fix a certain peculiar and determinate character upon some portion of the Church of God. It was that union of qualities which we have attempted to describe, that accomplished the result. If he had a wish, it was expressed in the gentlest manner. If he had an opinion, it was uttered with a singular calmness and moderation. There was very little vehemence in him, very little of that outspoken and demonstrative earnestness, which, in the common judgment of men, conduces so much to efficiency. Men did not feel that they were influenced by him, nor the Diocese that a pressure was steadily moulding it into a particular form; but they *were* influenced, and *it* was receiving a shape which it keeps, and, if it is wise, will continue to keep. "A wise man, endued with knowledge," thoughtful, scholarly, intelligent, polished, replete with useful and ornamental learning, and richer still in that better knowledge which made him a firm, devout, and conscientious believer, and a sound and accurate theologian, "he shewed, out of a good conversation, his works, with meekness of wisdom," in the beauty of a consistent and symmetrical

life, calm, even, consistent, benevolent, maintaining his views with an unassuming modesty, enlightened, judicious, and dignified, always gentle and indulgent, never arbitrary, pragmatical, severe, conceited, or contemptuous.

Yet it cannot be said that Bishop Brownell's was a striking character. It did not sparkle, or astonish, or draw attention. It was too complete and well-proportioned to strike. Peculiarity strikes; and peculiarity is the result of the development of one quality at the expense of others. His were too evenly developed to be peculiar; and hence he was remarkable, principally, by his exemption from any such excess, in the completeness, roundness, and kindly combination of all the parts of his nature. Such a character does not strike; and at first view may not seem to be so strong as one really much weaker, in which some prominent trait, working forcibly and conspicuously, may seem to be effecting greater achievements; but it grows upon knowledge and upon observation of results.

We think this eminently true, in the case of Bishop Brownell. We doubt whether any one of our Bishops has communicated, to his portion of the Church, a more distinct tinge of thought and feeling, style of Churchmanship, tone of opinion and of practice, than the last Bishop of Connecticut. Connecticut has become, and steadfastly stands, as it were, the reflection of its wise, moderate, gentle, yet firm Chief Pastor. In his official administration, there was no dictation and no proscription, scarcely such a thing as inquiry, the largest tolerance, the most even-handed impartiality. He never governed by Shibboleths or tests. He knew his Clergy only as Ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Yet the result was not, what some weaker and more impatient men would have predicted, conflict, but harmony,—not variation, but a remarkable uniformity. It may be safely said that in no other portion of the Church is there greater unity of feeling, sameness of belief, or agreement in action. Yet this happy result has not been attained by compromise or concealment, by any vagueness of statement or ambiguity of position. In all that constitutes the substance of Church principles, the position of the Diocese has ever been definite, steady, unequivocal. For while

no man in his office was ever less inclined to press his own views on others, to restrain freedom of thought and action, or force a certain tinge of doctrine and policy on his Diocese, and compel it into a certain determinate mould of sentiment and practice; a steady and more insensible influence did that work far more effectually. And the Church in Connecticut stands, to-day, in its large, comprehensive, impartial spirit, its calm, uniform, vigorous growth, and its steady, quiet, consistent line of policy, the copy of its sagacious, moderate, firm, yet generous leader. There is no where else such freedom from party, such homogeneousness of opinion, such unity of action, and no where such an effective and successful exclusion of views and measures contrary to those of its Episcopal Head. Divisive plans, rival organizations, schemes of men who rally round a dogma or an idea, magnified by party spirit into an undue prominence and value, get no foothold within its borders. And yet, there has been no ostracism, and no inquisitorial questioning. The Bishop's quiet and loving wisdom has been a solvent in which varying opinions and tendencies have insensibly melted and flowed together, and brethren have learned to dwell together in unity, who, under other circumstances, might have been arrayed against one another in acrimonious controversy and opposition.

In this genial atmosphere of peace the Church in Connecticut has grown and flourished; so that, during its last Bishop's term of service, "a little one has become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation," and, in proportion to the population of the territory which it embraces, it is the strongest in the country; while yet, out of its migratory race, it has sent forth into every part of the land, stable, intelligent, and earnest Clergymen and Laymen, to lay foundations, or to build up the walls that have been begun by others. A Connecticut Churchman has come to be a name that entitles men to respect and confidence, in all parts of our communion; for it indicates a man, who, while he is true to the Church and her principles, open and manly in their profession, bold and steadfast in their maintenance, conservative in policy, a friend to order and peace, an enemy of innovation, oddity, and extravagance,

is no extremist, no advocate of ultra notions or practices, one who will neither coquet with Rome, nor fraternize with Geneva, but will be true to himself, while he follows peace with all men. And this distinction, we believe, he owes, in a principal degree, to the influence of the late Bishop, steadily and quietly exerted during a peaceful administration of more than forty years, with a formative and assimilating power all the more successful because unconsciously put forth and insensibly obeyed, working happily on that substratum of deep-seated and intelligent convictions which had been firmly laid in those "troubled times", when Johnson, and Cutler, and Beach fought manful battles with Puritan narrowness and intolerance, and in later times, Seabury struggled, amidst prejudice and ridicule, and the impoverishment and animosity consequent upon the War of Independence, to be what he so eminently became, "the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in."

When Bishop Brownell came into the Diocese of Connecticut, in 1819, its condition was far from prosperous or encouraging. Its Parishes were few and small, and these were very inadequately supplied with Ministers. A few of their number had the exclusive services of a Rector, very scantily paid. The greater part were parcelled out into groups of two or three, or even four or five, among which a single Clergyman distributed his ministrations, gaining a slender living from their joint contributions. The Church had not yet recovered from the shock of the Revolution. The stigma of disloyalty was scarcely wiped away, while yet, by a strange paradox, she was attracting to herself the democratic element in the State, as a convenient stand-point of attack on the tyranny of "the Standing Order." The Episcopate of Bishop Jarvis was not a period of much growth and improvement. He was advanced in years. Disease unfitted him for active exertion. And he was annoyed and circumvented by the unscrupulous arts of one who, in his day, was a noted troubler of Israel. An interregnum of six years after his decease had not made things better. The Diocese had split into cliques. There were various aspirants for its mitre. The occasional visits of such excellent men as Ho-

bart and Griswold, and the provisional oversight of the former, during the latter part of the time, could not supply the want.

Connecticut was not an inviting field, when Bishop Brownell entered upon it. The sagacity of Bishop Hobart selected him for the work, and the result proved his discernment. The presence of the new Diocesan was like oil on the troubled waters; and never did that "meekness of wisdom," which was his distinguishing characteristic, display itself more advantageously and effectively, than in that early period. Discord gave place to peace, and supineness to activity. Yet he was never what would be called a stirring Bishop. His preaching was not at all sensational. There was no fuss in him. He had not the style of character which is wont to attract popular admiration and applause. He was calm, courteous, gentle, dignified; a little too fine, it might have been thought, for common use, of scholastic tastes and ways, fitter for the chair of a city Bishopric, than of one whose people were engaged, for the most part, in the avocations of rural life as it then was. But he did his own work well, diligently, faithfully, patiently, cheerfully; and he was no meddler; he did not mar the work of other men by officiousness, or dictation, or superfluous advice. If any man would work, he would let him work, and in his own way, content to bestow on him a smile of encouragement, a timely word of approbation. He did not over-Bishop it, but he magnified his office in another way. He had admirable common sense, tact, discernment, insight into men, perception of the fitness of times and places. He remembered that there is "a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;" and he was "a man that had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do." He knew how to distinguish the little from the great; and while, in the former, he was passive or yielding, he was, in the latter, firm as a rock. He let trifles be trifles; but principles he would contend for with an immovable firmness. If the question were one that involved important truth or right, no man could move him.

There were passages in his life, which we will not rake open the ashes of slumbering strifes to mention, in which this was very strikingly seen. His amiability and love of peace may



possibly sometimes have led him astray. It was hard for him to do a harsh or a severe thing. Yet, "e'en his failings leaned to virtue's side." They were the faults of one who loved men, and pitied human infirmity, and could not bear contention and disturbance. Perhaps this may have led him, sometimes, to prefer temporary expedients that would still contention and prevent scandal, to more painful, but far-reaching and effectual remedies. He was familiar, affable, playful, but never undignified or light. His social affections were strong, and he greatly enjoyed life and its blessings; and there was never anything morose, querulous, or forbidding about him.

As he grew old, the sunshine brightened around him. His was a beautiful old age. He loved men as his children; men loved him as a father. There was no jealousy, no repining, no littleness in his soul. "The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, kept his heart and mind, through Christ Jesus." Well and beautifully has the Bishop of Maine said:—

"We must adore the blessed Spirit, Whose fruits are love and joy and peace, for the example which, in that foremost place, we so long have witnessed of all that was kindly, forbearing, compassionate, generous, conciliating, of gratitude towards God, and benevolence towards mankind; of the beatitude of the meek and the peace-maker; of a conversation of which the memory of much intercourse can recall no word that seemed to indicate an uncharitable thought; and of a conduct which scarcely, at any time, drew on itself a severer reproof than that of an unwillingness to wound. Wise he was, and learned and able and honored, yet the first title which will attend him to his grave, springing everywhere from the lips of those who saw him most nearly, will be that of the *good* Bishop; and for the love and the peace which dwelt in him, and to which that spontaneous tribute bears witness,—God's holy name be praised."

Under such a genial influence, the Diocese of Connecticut has thriven and made progress, scarcely conscious of the blessing it was enjoying, till the fruit is matured and the work is ended; as the flower thinks not of the sun and dew, that have, nevertheless, blessed its springing, and given to its petals their beauty and their fragrance. And now, that the good man is gone, the Diocese remains his best memorial before the eyes of the world. He needs no "labor of an age in piled stones:" "*si quæris monumentum, circumspice.*"



THOMAS CHURCH BROWNELL, D. D., LL. D., third Bishop of Connecticut, was "born at Westport, in the State of Massachusetts, on the 19th day of October, in the year 1779," in the midst of the Revolutionary War, the oldest of eleven children. His "father was the fourth in descent from George Brownell," by whom the land on which he was born was purchased from the Narraganset Indians. His mother was a descendant of the celebrated Col. Benjamin Church, famous in the Indian Wars, and the conqueror of King Philip; and from his maternal grandfather he derived his Christian name. He grew up on his father's farm in Westport, enjoying such advantages of education as the common country schools of that day afforded. In his boyhood, the amiability and fondness for peace, which through life distinguished him, displayed themselves so strongly, that he became known as a peace-maker, and the boys of his acquaintance fastened upon him the sobriquet of "Old Smoothing Plane." At the very early age of fifteen, when no teacher could be obtained for the school in his district, he consented to act as schoolmaster; and, as he himself states, in a brief sketch of his early life which he left behind him, "succeeded in securing the respect of his former schoolmates,"—no small testimony both to his mental development, and his excellence of character. What a foreshadowing is here of the man in the boy's daily life? Who does not see the embryo Bishop in the young pupil and teacher of the New England country school?

When he was about eighteen years old, after a few months' study with the Pastor of the village congregation, he went to Bristol Academy, Taunton, to prepare for College. In September, 1800, he entered the Freshman Class in the College of Rhode Island, now known by the name of Brown University. Two years after, Dr. Maxcy, who was then the President of the Institution, removed to Schenectady, as President of Union College. Young Brownell accompanied him, drawn by a strong personal attachment, and a desire to preserve the benefit of his highly valued instructions. Here he graduated in 1804, at the head of his Class, and with its highest honors.

His mind had, before this time, been drawn to the study of

Theology ; but the difficulties of the Calvinistic System soon began to perplex and repel him. He placed himself under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Nott, then a prominent Presbyterian Clergyman in Albany, and since, the distinguished President of his Alma Mater. For a solution of his difficulties, Dr. Nott put him upon the study of the early history of the Church. He read Mosheim, and this awakened in him a desire for fuller and more minute information. Dr. Nott referred him to Echard. But Echard's Early Church was plainly not Congregational or Presbyterian, but much nearer to the Episcopal scheme. Dr. Nott made light of his perplexity, and "jocularly" sent him to Dr. Beasley, the Episcopal Minister. Dr. Beasley gave him "Potter on Church Government." "The perusal of this work," says the Bishop himself, "was like the opening of a new world to me." His head was convinced, but his heart found it hard to break away from old attachments, and go among strangers. He had no Episcopal relatives or friends. He went home to his father's, to give himself time for reflection and inquiry.

But soon Dr. Nott was elevated to the Presidency of his College, and he was made Tutor in Latin and Greek. Two years later, he was appointed Professor of *Belles Lettres* and Moral Philosophy ; and, after two years, was transferred to the Chair of Chemistry and Mineralogy. To qualify himself for the duties of his office, and obtain the requisite apparatus, he went abroad. He sailed for Europe in the Autumn of 1809, and spent a year in attending Lectures and travelling over Great Britain, chiefly on foot. And it was during these pedestrian peregrinations, that he, with a companion, was, on one occasion, arrested on suspicion of being concerned in a robbery and murder ; a charge ludicrously inconsistent with his harmless and amiable character.

In 1810, he returned to America, and entered on the duties of his Professorship. The year after, he was married. This brought him into closer association with Churchmen, and gave his previous bias a more determinate form. Up to this time he was unbaptized, having been reared under the narrow notions of Congregationalism. He received baptism in St.

George's Church, Schenectady, Sept. 5th, 1813, at the hands of the Rev. Cyrus Stebbins, then the Rector of that Church ; and shortly after was confirmed and admitted to the Holy Communion. Now, his attention was again drawn to the study of Theology ; and on the 11th of April, 1816, he was ordained Deacon, by Bishop Hobart, in Trinity Church, New York, and soon after, in the same place, by the same Prelate, was admitted to the Priesthood. Retaining his position in the College, he officiated in various Parishes, as there was a call for his services. The year after, his health failed, and by the advice of physicians, he spent the Winter at the South, travelling extensively through the country, and visiting the principal cities. On his return from this tour, he was chosen an Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New York, and soon entered upon the duties of his place.

Here he thought he had reached the ultimate goal of his life ; but God had other thoughts concerning him. In June, 1819, he was chosen Bishop of Connecticut. And on the 27th day of October, 1819, he was consecrated to the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, in Trinity Church, New Haven, by the venerable Bishop White, assisted by Bishops Hobart and Griswold, only three and a half years after his admission to the Diaconate. While he remained in connection with Union College, he exerted a decided and useful influence in secular affairs, as a man of science, and of public spirit, and was an adviser and coadjutor of DeWitt Clinton, in projecting that great work of internal improvement, the Erie Canal.

We will not trace, minutely, the course of his Episcopal administration. Its general character has been already portrayed. Two points in it stand out with special prominence. In the infancy of our Domestic Missions, he undertook and prosecuted successfully an extensive survey of the country bordering on the Mississippi, down to New Orleans. His researches and reports gave a new impetus to the Missionary work ; and in this way, as well as in many others, his influence was felt for good beyond his own immediate field of labor.

In 1824, by his exertions, he established Washington, now Trinity College. Of this institution, he was emphatically the

father ; and to the last day of his life he regarded it with a truly paternal solicitude and affection. It has given to the Church a large number of her ablest and most useful Ministers. And though it has never received at the hands of Churchmen the support and patronage it has deserved, it has been a source of incalculable good, and its founder, in the enlightened and far-reaching wisdom that projected it, would be, on that account alone, entitled to the lasting and grateful remembrance of the Church. He was, till 1831, its President, and when the pressing duties of the Episcopate compelled him to relinquish that office, he was made its Chancellor, and continued to occupy that dignity up to the time of his death.

At last, in 1851, when he had passed far on in his seventy-second year, the burden of age and the sense of growing infirmities admonished him to retire from active service, and devote his remaining years to setting his house in order, and preparing for the last great change. At his request, an Assistant Bishop was chosen, and, in entire accordance with his wishes, the Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS, D. D., was selected for that Office. He was consecrated in St. John's Church, Hartford, Oct. 29, 1851, and is now the fourth Bishop of Connecticut. Perhaps, a trying and delicate relation was never more beautifully filled, than this, by both the parties. The older Bishop cherished, towards the younger, a truly paternal confidence and affection ; and the younger repaid the elder, with a truly filial respect and tenderness. Bishop Brownell was never distrustful, or jealous, or peevish, or captious, or dictatorial. He said, without a murmur, what so few can say cheerfully and gracefully, as the Baptist did of our SAVIOUR, "He must increase, but I must decrease."

Soon after, the death of Bishop Chase elevated him to the dignity of Presiding Bishop, and he held it thirteen years. But he soon began to withdraw from the active duties of his Office ; and during the last years of his life, he ceased to officiate altogether. In the bosom of his family, soothed by their affectionate attentions, the evening of his life glided serenely and pleasantly away, in favor with God and in perfect charity with men. When, at last, the summons came, he had nothing

to do but to die. And so, bequeathing the Diocese to that successor, who so long, "as a son with the father, had served with him in the Gospel," and to whom he could say, in his dying hour, "there has never been a shadow between us," he departed in peace, to be with Christ, which is far better ;—the oldest of all our Prelates in term of Office, and in years, but the venerable White, at the advanced age of eighty-four, having realized in his life, in far more than the ordinary measure, the prophet's beautiful description of the true Priest of God :—

"The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips ; he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from their iniquity."

## ART. VI.—THE MEETING OF THE WEST AND THE EAST.

'RHAMI,' 'the Black' or the Hamitic races were the first with whom civilization commenced in Asia. To them we owe the monuments and the wisdom of Egypt, the mighty organization of the Cushite and Ethiopian Conquerors, Assyria, Babylon, and Nineveh, as well as Tirhakah and Raamses. Next after them the Shemite Races appear upon the theatre of Asia. And, last of all, the great flood of Japhetic or Indo-Germanic races in Asia, start from the Indian Caucasus, Hindus and Medes, Armenian and Persians. And, by and by, our own ancestral streams ;—Celts, the eldest sons of European History ;—and Hellenes next, (the Romans are an infinitely compound race ;) thirdly, the Scandinavian or Gothic-German flood ; and lastly, the Slavons, (Slavi, 'sons of glory,' subdued in North Germany by the Teutons, and most strangely giving their name to "Slaves" and "Slavery ;") the toughest and most tenacious, the most loyal and the most religious, naturally, of the four great Arian emigration-floods that have reached Europe from Asia.

But what is all this to us in the United States ? This, that WE are the last result of that emigration that began from Hindu Koosh, in the grey dawn of time. We are the ultimate form which the Indo-Germanic race has assumed, in its last and final abode.

There are three historic Continents ; Asia, Europe, North America ; three savage Continents, Africa, South America, Australia. From the huge spaces of the Asiatic Continent, wave after wave, for two thousand years, the Indo-Germanic flood of nations spread themselves over the islands of Europe, its sea-divided spaces, its lands comminuted by mountain-ridges into territorial fortresses of tribal nations. And then, finally, in these last days, German and English, Scotch and Irish, Swede, Norwegian and Dane, French and Hollander and Swiss and Belgian, have gathered themselves up from the

small, broken spaces of Europe, into one flood, to make a new Arian race in one broad land.

The Græco-Roman race alone is wanting. It will not be wanting long. The region of the vine and the olive is opened up now to free labor. We believe, ere long, it will receive from Spain and Greece and Italy and Southern France, an immigration of the Greco-Roman races, into a kindred climate and kindred agriculture. Thus in its ultimate seat, enthroned in the valley of the Mississippi, with one sea-front upon the Atlantic, looking to the Europe she has left, another on the Pacific, opposite to her native Asia, and the third, Southward, on the Gulf, the Indo-Germanic race has found its final resting-place, the throne from which it will dominate the world.

What then of the present Negro population of the South? Nothing. Simply nothing. Their being freed has, as its one effect, the elimination of them as an element from the nation. For there is nothing more certain to us than that the negro never shall intermingle, so as to form a component part of the ultimate American race and people. Slavery might have produced that result, by means of its concubinage. Freedom forbids intermarriage. The negro race must pass away. Those of them that are wise, when peace comes, will pass over to their native Africa, and ensure to the Liberian Republic, perhaps to the whole Continent of Africa, the civilization, the religion, the language of this land. And those that are not wise, will perish of the diseases of a tropical race, in a climate unsuited for them.

This country, therefore, we look upon as the ultimate habitation of the Indo-Germanic race, the broad land wherein, gathered from the many countries of Europe, it will dwell as one people, and one nation, with all the powers it has developed, all the good qualities it has evolved during the two thousand years of its sojourn in Europe. Its travels have terminated. Its emigrations are at an end. The work that God has for it to do in the world, lies at length before it.

And what is this work for itself, internally, and for the whole wide world that lies outside its limits? This is the problem which must shortly occupy the minds of all men, the one



grand problem towards which, even now, all the intellects of the American world are bending their gaze, most anxiously, through the gloom of the advancing years. We purpose, in this paper, to contribute our portion towards its solution ; and that, we hope, in no vain spirit of speculation or vague reverie, but holding fast, on the one hand, to the history of the past, on the other, to the fact of a Church upon the Earth, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic ; with these two as our limiting instruments and our guides, to trace out from the present, the final issue towards which we are going on.

Now, the first consideration to which we would point our readers is, one but little thought of, the peculiar influence which seas exert in the progress of the world. Let us look backward over history. There we shall see the Persian Empire, leaning upon the Caspian, the Euxine, the Mediterranean, and most strangely taking its triple character, Scythian, Asiatic, European, from these three seas ; the Greek race, almost made and moulded by the Eastern Mediterranean and its manifold islands ; the Roman Empire, a rim of land all around what they truly called the Inner or Central Sea ; then, the next European movements, those of the Northmen, were wholly based upon the Baltic, the inner or central Sea of the Scandinavian tribes. And now the movement, in the whirl and hurry of which we are, is essentially of the ocean, the Atlantic. All onward progress, that is real, toward the final result, the ultimate issue of the World's History, has always been connected with the seas of the world.

What remains ? The last movement, and the greatest of seas, the Indian Ocean. Three times the width of the Atlantic, actually reaching from Pole to Pole,—for the Indian and Pacific together are but one Great Ocean,—crowded with countless Islands, bordered by the greatest races of the world, what remains, but that around that greatest of oceans the last scenes of the world's history, the final consummation of all things, should be completed ?

If we look to the events of the last few years, it is most remarkable how all things are pointing and leading us onward towards that great world of waters. Let us look, for instance,

at the gold discoveries. But for them, California would have remained a cattle-feeding territory, unheard of but for its exportation of hides and tallow. As it is, the discovery of gold has made it an American State, with a great commercial city of sixty-thousand inhabitants, seated upon the shores of the Ocean. See how Australia, from an Island only known for its merino wool, has, by means of its gold-fields, attracted a great population, and made itself the beginning of a huge New world, a new race of English-descended people, in the middle of the ocean. And the gold in the English colony of New Columbia, has had the same effect ; it has indicated and suggested a new path from Canada across the wilderness towards the great sea.

Our mines, again, in the Rocky Mountains, have had the same effect. Each settlement that we make Westward, each city that we build, is the footstep of a giant race, trampling across a continent to stand, full grown, on the shores of the ocean, looking towards the East, towards Asia, the land of its birth. All events are leading the Indo-Germanic races onward toward the Pacific and Indian seas.

In fact, let our Pacific Railroad only be completed and in working order, so that we can as easily reach California from the Mississippi Valley as we do New York, and within twenty years, a settled population of twenty millions crowds the Pacific Slope ; farmers from the North Western States of the Mississippi Valley, merchants to compete for the commerce of the Indian Islands, of Japan and China and Hindustan ; mechanics to construct the giant Steamers which those huge spaces will require, such as the genius of Brunel taught us how to build, and as can be a commercial success only on the great sea, among its spice-bearing labyrinth of Islands, reaching over a space of three thousand miles in length, large as European kingdoms, crowded with energetic inhabitants. The great ocean, and the great continent of Asia, together, are a marvellous theatre and stage for the last scenes of this world's history. And it needs but a single step for the American race and people, to stand complete in all its proportions upon the shore of that great ocean.

On the Western side of the American continent, we own over nine hundred miles of Pacific coast, only needing the Railroad that is to connect it with the Mississippi Valley. On the Eastern coast of Asia, about the same time, Russia obtained the valley of the Amour or Saghalien, and made her appearance on the coast of the ocean ;—Russia and America, the two greatest nations of the world, standing one over against the other, on the West and the East of the greatest waters of the world.

Asia is the mother of the human race. From her bosom all have come. The mingled Shemite and Hamitic races, which cover Africa ; the swarming Mongols, the Arian, or Japhetic races, all arise from her. From the Indian Caucasus is the centre of dispersion for them all. Pamer, the table-land from which they came, is called, by the Tartars to this day, the roof of the world. All those arts we used to read of in our boyhood as invented by our European ancestors, all, in the germ or perfected, came from Asia. Through Spanish Arabs or Greek caravan-merchants, or European Crusaders, through many a channel, the East conferred its arts and sciences upon Europe. And then, one man, forsooth ! invented Gunpowder ; another, the Mariner's Compass ; another, Algebra ; another, the Art of Printing ; another, the use of Mercurial Medicines ; another, Artesian wells,—and Europe sang triumphantly the genius of her sons. And finally, the literature of the East was opened to the eyes of Europeans, and lo ! China and Hindustan had known all these things for thousands of years !

But when we come to the matter of History and Religion, the Asiatic influence is stranger still. Our own history is very obscure, nay, unknown, for thousands of years. Who were the leaders of the Celts, the first historic race of Europe from Hindu Koosh ? Is Oden the chief of the Teutonic races who came with his Asæ from Asgard, a leader of men, a heathen God, or merely an abstraction ? And the Greek leaders that passed from the European Caucasus, onward along the Euxine, until they reached Asia Minor, and the land of Hellas—who were they, and what is their history ? In fact, it is only from the science of modern Philology, only from the comparative

anatomy of languages, that we know our own origin. The Arian races came from one common centre in Asia. This we know. And in two thousand years, more or less, they were in Europe, first the Celts, then the Hellenes, next the Teutons, and lastly the Slavons. The history of the Hellenic race begins with Herodotus, four hundred and fifty years before Christ; of the Celts and Teutons, in the days of Marius and Cæsar; and of the Slavons, long after the fall of the Roman Empire. Our ancestral history, between these two limits of their rise in Asia and their settlement in Europe, is hid in mist and gloom. We discern, faintly, figures of hosts, and heroic marching from the East, Westward towards Europe, emigration-flood after emigration-flood. And then we find them there. Then their history and their European training begins.

Now let us again go backward towards Asiatic story. Our own ancestral history, as we have seen, is wholly forgotten,—never to be known. But Shinar, Nineveh, and Babylon, are household words, known and familiar to our childhood. And most strangely, in our own day, the Ninevitic and Assyrian Records are disinterred, and the very sculpture-portraits of the Chaldean conquerors are shown us. The records of their palaces stand undisputed before our eyes. And the Asiatic history of the Bible and Herodotus are confirmed by annals stored until now in the earth. Egypt, with its Pharaohs, is most familiar to our own ears from childhood. Cyrus, also, and Darius, are to us better known, more certainly historic characters, than Hengist and Horsa. In fact, on the rocks of Behistan, in Media, two hundred feet above the level, are to be seen the graven records of the great king Darius himself. They are copied, read, and interpreted by Rawlinson in this nineteenth century for the first time.

But let us think more closely still. Here is Abraham, coming from Ur of the Chaldees, two or three generations after Nimrod. From him there is a clear stream of historic narrative, onward, till the Hebrew annals flow into the current of the Greek and the Roman History. It is perfectly familiar to our childhood, the continuous history of that Shemite race, with whom we have nothing common in blood or in descent,

our own history being utterly unknown for more than two thousand years ! Strange that the records of an Asiatic tribe and nation, which never reached above six or eight millions of people, should be the central current of all history, the only stream that reaches, unbroken, ever traceable from the Flood, down to the present time.

But, to carry on this train of thought, when we come to look at the matter of Religion, more fully still the influence of Asia is manifested. We enter a Church to perform our devotions, the ground plan of that Church is framed in Nave and Chancel, after the plan which Moses saw upon Mount Sinai, and after which the Tabernacle, and the Temple of Solomon, were built, the Nave representing the Holy Place, and the Chancel, the Holy of Holies ! And this is true, not by mere guess-work, but by a sure historic and written tradition. Again, our Church Service, in its two parts, follows the Synagogue and the Temple-Service ; our three-fold Ministry, the Mosaic hierarchy, of High-priest, Priests, and Levites. The Psalms we chant were chanted by Israel, some in the Wilderness, some in the Temple, and some by the waters of Babylon. Their music is a tradition from the Hebrew ritual. The very prayers we utter, our Liturgic Service, all are traditions from the East.

Look again at our Scriptures. Job, the Idumean Prince ; Moses, born by the ancient Nile ; Samuel, and Solomon, and Isaiah, from Jerusalem ; Daniel, from Persia, by the river Ulai ; and Jeremiah, from Babylon,—all these form and frame our ideas from our childhood.

And when the Saviour comes, when God the Word is incarnate for the salvation of man, he is born in Asia, of the Shemite race, a son of Abraham and of David.

A language is prepared for the final revelation of the truth, the ultimate manifestation in Him of all the eternal verities of Heaven ; a language unequalled in power of expression, in lucidity, in beauty, capable of expressing, with equal clearness, the sublimest ideas, and the subtlest distinctions of thought.

A nation, too, is made ready, for hundreds of antecedent years, to subdue the savage world of Europe and West Asia into one empire, to organize them into one dominion, ruled by

laws and obedient to discipline, so that a way should be made for the progress of the Gospel. And lo ! outside the wide Greek World, which reached from Bactria, on the East, (Balkh in Bokhara in modern times,) to Olbia, on the Boristhenes, on the West,—outside this wide Greek world of commerce, literature, and democratic ideas, the men who were to use that language in propagation of Christianity were born. All the books of the New Testament were to be written in Greek ; for two hundred years, all the literature of Christianity was to be in Greek. And, of the writers of the New Testament, not one was, by birth, a Greek ! Our Saviour and His Apostles, and His Evangelists, all were Shemites, speaking the Aramean or Syriac tongue !

And none of them were of the Roman race ;—none spoke Latin as their vernacular. That race, its powers, its peculiarities of talent and temper, was to be a most influential agent of the Gospel ; yet there seems actually to have been no Latin Christian literature, until it was imported from North Africa, three to four centuries after Christ ! Cyprian and Tertullian, of Carthage, and Augustine, of Hippo,—these were the Fathers of Roman Christianity ! No Celt, no Greek, no Roman, no Teuton, no Slavon, was one of the originators and publishers of the Gospel. It was, essentially, Shemite and Asiatic. The Indo-Germanic races in Europe adopted it, propagated it with fervent zeal, were seized upon and possessed by it. But it arose not among them. No Shemite race in Asia holds it now, some minute fragments excepted ; no Indo-Germanic people that inhabit that great Continent or its islands. No Mongol or Turanic nation in Asia profess it. Christianity, in the land of its birth, among the people with whom it originated, is almost non-existent.

Asia is eight thousand miles wide, from East to West ; five thousand miles in length, from North to South. It is the native land of the human race. It even now contains seven hundred and fifty, of the twelve hundred millions of people that inhabit the globe. It is also the native land of Christianity, and Christianity, as we have said, is almost non-existent in it. And this is the nineteenth century after Christ !

But the question may be asked, fairly, "was Asia ever Christianized in any way?" Was it not the fact, that Christianity did not succeed there, from the first, but at once transferred itself to the European races, as most suited to their temper and feelings? adapted to the culture and the character of Greeks and Romans, rather than of Asiatics? Was it not this, that it never penetrated into Asia, rather than that it perished from the Asiatic continent? With the intense self-feeling of the European races, we are apt to think that it was so, that the Greek and Latin races alone were Christianized, and that Asia but slightly received the Christian Faith, or, at least, that the European settlers only of the Asiatic regions were Christianized.

It will startle our readers to understand, that this was not the case; that until the Seventh Century, there was a huge Eastern Christianity, estimated fairly at seven to ten times the size of the coëval Christianity of Europe, Roman and Greek together; that it was not simply the religion of settlers, of European blood in Asia, but of the purely Shemite race; that it had passed onward, as a Missionary Church, and had, most probably, reached Hindustan, and China, and the Islands of the Indian Seas.

Now, the first thing to look at, in this inquiry, is the matter of population. At the present time, West Asia is far from populous. Turkey, in Asia, embracing, we may say, the best portion of the former Roman Empire in the East, has hardly twenty to the square mile, in a country which, under a settled Christian government of any kind, would easily sustain a population of two hundred to the square mile; one hundred and sixty millions, where there are twelve or fifteen. East Asia now swarms with inhabitants. China, for instance, has from one hundred, to five hundred, to the square mile. The reverse was formerly the case. West Asia, under the Roman Empire, down at least to the first Mohammedan Conquest, was crowded with inhabitants; was studded with huge cities, whose population we know to have been enormous, was manufacturing, and agricultural, and commercial, to a great extent, from the Bosphorus to the Caspian Sea, from the Mediterranean, east-



ward, to the limits of Persia. This we know to have been its condition. It was the richest, the most productive, the most populous country of the world. It seems to have been settled, mainly, by two races. The Shemite people, speaking the Aramaean language, and the Greek-speaking populations ; the one class preponderating toward the East, and the other, Westward.

Now, as a matter of simple fact, what was the state of Christianity in this region of Asia ? Let us take the first portion, in which the Aramaic population prevailed, and we have eighty-four Christian Bishopricks. Herein are Antioch, Berytus, Aleppo, Damascus, Edessa, Tyre, Amida, Palmyra, Nisibis, Ctesiphon, Seleucia, and many more,—a swarm of populous cities, reaching onward from the Mediterranean into the territories of Persia.

But it may be pretended that these Sees were nominal,—that the population was not so great—that it was hardly all Christianized. We will give an instance, once for all, Euphratesia, or Commagenè, a central region in that part, now almost desolate. In early days it was populous, and rich enough to be a kingdom. Several large cities were it ; Hierapolis, Samosata, and others. We have the evidence of Theodorit, the Bishop of Cyrus, by no means one of the largest cities in that region, as to the extent of population and the prevalence of Christianity there in the fifth century. He tells us that his Diocese, in extent, was forty miles long, and forty miles broad ; that he had eight hundred Churches within that space ! That when he came to it, he found it overrun with heretics. And that he himself had reconciled upwards of ten thousand of one sort only, the Marcionites ! What an idea this gives us of the density of the population, and the universal prevalence therein of Christianity, when now Christianity is almost gone, and but a few wanderers exist upon the soil that has supported and might support tens of thousands !

We look now at Asia Minor, embracing a space equal to about five or six States, of the average size in the American Union. In this region were four hundred Bishopricks ! We find in it the same evidences of an exceedingly dense popula-

tion, and of the almost universal profession of the Christian Faith in the Sixth Century. It is not at all unlikely that this region had thirty to sixty millions of inhabitants, under the successors of Constantine, until the Seventh Century, and the commencement of the Mohammedan conquests. A settled population, devoted to agriculture and industry, in a semi-tropical climate, under a government of uniform and steady organization, as regards police, will increase in wealth and in numbers almost miraculously. And we must not forget, that no Tartar raiders, or Saracens, or Turkomans, had reached them then. The races of Asia Minor, at that time, were almost exclusively Indo-Germanic or Shemite, more predominantly the former. Even their invaders, of the most savage kind, were, after the era of Christianity, until Mohammed, of the Indo-Germanic race. It remains for us to say, that in Palestine there were forty-seven Bishopricks! And in that portion of Arabia which was a province of the Roman Empire, there were thirty-four!

Sum up the whole, and we have West Asia, down to the year six hundred and forty-three, abounding in wealth, and overflowing with population, to a degree hardly conceivable by us. And this population was almost altogether Christian, speaking two languages, the Greek, and Aramaic or Syrian, almost exclusively. It was all under the dominion of the Eastern or Byzantine Emperors, and in it, within the limits of the Empire, were five hundred and seventy-six Christian Bishopricks! Industry, population, wealth, Christianity, have almost perished from these regions now. All would rise again under a steady government. Even a despotism of the sternest kind, would be a blessing to those regions, if it were only uniform in its oppression,—had some rules for itself in its exactions. But the Turks have been simply an encampment of robbers, settled down upon the richest countries in the world, devouring up wealth and population and all resources, until they are stripped bare, and the ravagers and destroyers perish themselves, for sheer lack of sustenance.

We see then within the Roman Empire, in the East, what an immense Asiatic Christianity existed, until the Seventh

Century. We add but one thing to confirm this. The Christian literature of the East in Greek, down to the age of John of Damascus, is manifold that of the Latin Christian writers of the same period. And almost as extensive was the Christian Shemitic literature of Asia. A mass of Syrian Christian literature exists in manuscript, of which the catalogue is given by Asseman, in four volumes, folio. Of this literature, hardly anything is known, even to European scholars, except the works of Ephraim, the Syrian of Edessa, published at Rome in six volumes folio, 1723.

We come now to the consideration of the progress that Christianity made in Asia, outside the Roman Empire. And here we have evidence sufficient of a very great advance. The records of a Religion that has perished, are easily doubted or denied. But when we look to the regions of Asiá, beyond the dominions of Rome, we find weighty and abundant proof that a very large Christian population once existed in them. We are not to forget how far Greek influence and culture had extended ; so much so, that the Parthian Empire was half Hellenized. Also, it must not be forgotten, that the Syrian or Aramaic branch of the Shemite race, now almost non-existent, once spread from the Mediterranean onward toward the East, far into Persia ; that the Syrians were almost altogether Christianized, and that they were filled with the most ardent Missionary spirit.

Outside the Roman Empire in Asia, we have Armenia, wholly converted to the Christian Faith. We have, again, a multitude of Christians living in Persia ; so many, indeed, that when Sapor the Old, the greatest of the Persian kings, began his first persecution, he slew, at one blow, twenty-five Bishops, whose names are preserved by Sozomen. Of these names, we can see, at first sight, that if some are Greek, the majority are Syrian and Persian. One of these Bishops is said to have had a Chorepiscopus, and two hundred and fifty Clergy ! This fact shows no small amount of Christian population in Persia. This was the first persecution in the long reign of Sapor. Two others occurred in his reign ; and, to use the words of the historian, "during fifty years, the Cross lay prostrate in blood and ashes."

On the whole, we must conclude that in Asia, beyond the limits of the Roman Empire, onwards towards the East, there was a very large Christian population. In fact, the Nestorians outside the Roman Empire, in the Fifth and ensuing Centuries, were neither more nor less than the old Aramæan Christian population of the East, driven into formal heresy by the tyranny and persecutions of the Byzantine emperors; and hearing that their missions reached to China, and Tartary, and Hindustan, we give them credit for a work that unquestionably had begun, perhaps was in a great measure done, long before their days.

Now, wherefore did Christianity perish from the East, as it undoubtedly has done? First, it was made the State-religion of the despotic Byzantine Empire. And intensely national as the Persian Empire was, Christianity was assailed by Persia as the Roman religion; the religion of their enemies. They slew the Christians as traitors to Persia,—adherents of an anti-national religion.

Our conclusion is, that Christianity had a wide spread, within and without the Roman Empire in Asia. It was made the State religion of the despotic Byzantine Empire. And therefore within it, it lost energy, freedom, and vigor of life. Therefore, outside of it, it was fiercely persecuted by Sapor, by Jezdegerd, Bahram, and Khosroes. The whole force of the Persian Empire, under its ablest kings, was exerted to crush the Christian religion. And then, when Mohammedanism overthrew, in the Seventh Century, the Persian Empire, we have reason to believe that a huge mass of Christians, speaking the Aramæan language, were at once absorbed by the kindred race of the Arabs, whose tongue had but the difference of a dialect from their own. Then, thirdly, piece by piece, province by province, the Empire of the East fell, totally, under the Turkish sway, establishing Mohammedanism as the State religion, devouring wealth, and crushing down population. Finally, the Mongol conquests in Asia under Genghis, and then under Tamerlane, swept down what remained of the Nestorian Church, the last remnant of the Missionary zeal of Asiatic Christianity.

Here, then, is the Christian Religion, originating in West Asia, advancing Eastward, spreading over populous and wealthy regions, and subduing the masses of the population to itself; and then made the State-religion of a despotic Empire, and perishing. Christianity in Asia took the sword, and perished by the sword.\*

Is this the final issue? Is this the ultimate result of the Gospel in the land of its nativity? It would seem so, if we merely looked to the ordinary course of events, and to the conduct of the Christian nations of Europe since the Turkish conquest. Here, for instance, is an anecdote of the East, in our own days. Damascus was taken by the Arabs in 634. The Cathedral of St. John the Baptist became the principal mosque of the city, and has remained so until now. Mr. Porter, an English traveler, got access to it in 1834, by the influence of a Turkish gentleman, who asked whether he could explain a certain inscription that had been left there. And lo! above where the Chancel had been, there was the inscription in the Septuagint Greek, "Thy Throne Oh God, Christ, is for ever and ever, a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Thy kingdom." And so, for twelve hundred years, this verse, asserting the Dominion and the Divinity of Christ, our Blessed Lord, has looked down on the worship of the fanatical Unitarians of Arabia! Damascus has one hundred and twenty thousand inhabitants, and is now the seat of the fiercest and most murderous Mohammedism of the East. No wonder, that men despair of the Gospel when such is its present state in the land of its birth. No wonder, they imagine that Christianity is, to all intents and purposes, dead in Asia.

Let us see what is alive there; what Gospel and Missionary work is to be done there. The races of Asia are divided, by the best Ethnographers, into three classes.

---

\* Church and State was as fully established by Justinian, as by Philip of Spain; and in many cases as bloodily and unrelentingly carried out. "Theodora, the Empress," for instance, "in a short reign, extirpated one hundred thousand Paulicians by the sword, the gibbet, or the flames."

The Turanian Race ; Chinese, Mongols, Tartars	
Toorkmans, Japanese, Malays, Tamuls,	450,000,000
Arian Races : Hindoos, Persians, Armenians, Aff-	
ghans, Belooches, Koords, Circassians, Ossetes,	200,000,000
Shemite Races ; Arabs, Syrians, and Jews,	100,000,000

Of course, this is but a rough calculation. The Indo-Germanic races, however, are clearly established in Ethnologic Science. That they are of one blood and one language with the Arian races of Europe, is as certain as anything can possibly be. The analysis of their languages, their traditions, their hereditary habits and feelings, their religious ideas, nay, their very features and personal appearance, manifest this. Take the two extremes, New England and Hindustan. Any one that shall examine the colored engravings, we will say in Prichard's works, of the ordinary high caste Hundus, will be able to say, easily, that he has seen many such faces in New-England. Put color aside, and the portraits of a dozen intellectual high-caste Brahmins of this day might easily be mistaken for those of a dozen high-cultured Bostonians, of the Unitarian type. There is, however, something a great deal more rugged and stern and manly, than this amounts to, in other New Englanders, who have more faith in religious principles than they have in culture.

The Shemites in Asia are vastly reduced in number by the almost extinction of the Aramæans, a Syrian branch once so numerous. Still, it may be doubted whether the Syrian and Hellenic races in Asia are so much destroyed as absorbed. We know, for instance, that the Parthians, the people of the great Empire of Asia, in the Roman era, universally believed themselves to be Scythians, that is, Turanians. Yet, modern Ethnologists consider them an Indo-Germanic race. Both opinions, most likely, are true, and reconciled by the fact that their empire absorbed, to a very great extent, the population and the language of the Greeks in Asia. So, no doubt, the Arab and Seldjick conquerors of West Asia absorbed a great proportion of the Aramaic and Arian blood of the nations of higher civilization whom they overthrew. The other branch of the Shemites, the Arab race, still exists ; Sixty millions, at

the least, all arising from Arabia, and scattered over the Eastern continents and the two oceans. The Turanian races are five hundred millions or more. The Chinese, the Tartars, and the Japanese, seem to be true specimens of this race, a continental, an island and a nomad people, of the same origin. Many branches of them, however, seem to have been considerably mingled with Shemite and Indo-Germanic blood.

Now the question comes before us, "In this great Asiatic continent, among the islands of this, the greatest ocean, what amount of Christian population is there in existence now, "in the nineteenth century after Christ?" Of the Religion that "is to cover the earth as the waters cover the great deep," how much is in existence among the swarming millions of its own native land, and among the millions that crowd the greatest ocean, the ultimate waters of the Earth's final history? Are there fifty millions of Christians among the seven hundred and fifty millions of Asia? Certainly not. Are there twenty-five millions? Are there fifteen millions? We fear that this last number would cover all.

Let us, however, consider this question a little. We take our own kindred first, the Arian races in Asia. Here are the Hindoos, subtle, refined, cultivated, literary and philosophic to the highest degree,—one hundred and fifty millions of population belong to them. How many of these are Christians? Putting together the converts, if such there be remaining of the Nestorian or Syrian Christianity of early times, the Jesuit converts, the Travancore Missions, and those of the English Church of the last seventy-five years, we think that we should be puzzled to make out a million of baptized Hindoos.

We look then to the Arian races of the Second Persian Empire, embracing two-thirds of the present Persians, and also the Koords, Belooches, and Affghans,—say fifteen millions in all. We do not know of any Christians among them of the Arian race. There are some miserable and scanty remnants of the Nestorian Christians, to be sure, at Ooroomiah and other places in Persia, but these are of Shemite, not Arian blood.

Then we see almost the only Arian race in Asia that has preserved the Faith, the Armenians, a Christian people, esti-



mated at two and a half millions. The Russian possessions in Asia have a population of five millions ; is one half of this Christian ? In fact, in West Asia, the Christian population of Greeks and Armenians is considered to be three millions. Greek Christianity in Turkey lies, for the most part, in Turkey in Europe, as in Russia it is situated in Russia in Europe.

We go now to the Shemite races. The Arabs, as we have remarked, have swallowed up the Aramaic or Syrian population of Asia. Of the Arab race, in its native land of the Arabian Peninsula, and scattered over the Eastern continent as far as Cochin China, and abounding in the Islands of the Indian Ocean, as merchants and mariners, the number is not far from sixty millions. According to Baron Cuvier, cited by Prichard, this race, intellectually and physically, is superior to all other races upon the Earth, even to the boasted Europeans.\*

And how many of these sixty millions are Christians ? We may fairly answer,—none. Before Mahommed, there were multitudes. The number, in fact, of Shemite Christians in Asia is very small ; it may be computed to consist, exclusively, of the few Nestorians and Jacobites of Syrian descent.

We look, then, to the Turanian people. Of the three hundred millions of Chinese, how many are Christians ? Are there one million ? We hardly think so many. Are there any Christians among the thirty millions of Japanese, the farthest advanced of the Mongol nations ? None. Are there any Christians among the Malays, that Asiatic Ocean-race, of great enterprize and fierce energies ? They are the main inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago, which extends nearly three thousand miles in length, across the Indian Ocean, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, Celebes, Mindanao, Luzon, Papua ; Equatorial Islands of the hugest size, some of them twelve hundred miles in length, and of the richest tropical fertility, are in that region. And again, countless groups of smaller islands, celebrated by the natives for their beauty and fertility, but almost unknown to Europeans, are thickly sown over those seas. Over this Island-world the Malays swarm. They are, on a gigantic scale, what the Early Greeks of the Islands were in the Ho-

---

\* Prichard's *Natural History of Man*, pp. 134-5.

meric era, a race among whom piracy is maritime war, and highly honorable. Fleets of Malay proas, with ten thousand, or even fifty or one hundred thousand warriors on board, have not been unusual in the Indian Seas. And it may be said, there is not a day in which, throughout the Archipelago, the pirates are not afloat.

The Malays, and Island-races kindred to them, are in the American Encyclopedia counted to be one hundred and twenty millions. Say they are sixty millions. How many of them are Christians? We opine very few; some in the Manillas, some perhaps in Java, some few scattered over the more Southern Islands. But so far as the Malay race is concerned, in its masses, and at its great centres, it is untouched by the Gospel at this day.

We have finished our estimate. We should be glad to have one more favorable, but we are afraid that in Asia we must consider there are, setting aside Europeans, not more than ten or fifteen millions of a native Christian population,—hardly twenty millions.

This, then, we take to be the great work that lies before America, considered as a Christian people. The Gospel, assailing Asia from the shores of the Mediterranean, having for its standard-bearers the Syrian and the Greek, spread onward, victoriously sweeping on Eastward. And then, these races surrendered themselves to a low and slavish and debased form of Christianity; an unmanly sycophantic\* Faith. And the proud and arrogant Persian, the fierce, enthusiastic, and frugal Saracen, and the Seldjick rider, the Turk, and the rude Mongol, swept off the last fragment of an exhausted and nerveless Faith. And then, Christianity turned its steps Westward, among the turbulent, manly races of Europe; century after

---

\* The impious flattery of the Clergy of Constantinople, to Constantine, may be seen by an instance given by Eusebius, of which the blasphemy is most shocking. It is apparently taken from a sermon preached before the Emperor. Eusebius seems to think the 'Sacred Emperor' quite modest, in not accepting of it as his due. "One of God's Ministers presumed so far, in his own presence, as to pronounce him blessed, as having been counted worthy to hold absolute and universal empire in this life, and as being destined to share the empire of the Son of God in the world to come."—*Life of Constantine*, Book iv. Chap. 48

century, to cast aside the base component elements of the Byzantine theory, until finally it stands, here in this Western World, perfectly free from the State. Our race and nation is the first that has cast aside the theory of Constantine and the Byzantine Empire,—the supremacy of the Civil Power in the Church. Has not Christianity gone Westward, and found itself a home amidst a nation, of Arian race, one in blood, and million-peopled, that the work of Christianizing Asia, half done from the Mediterranean, Eastwardly, might be done anew, from the Indian Ocean, Westwardly, by a new race, raised up and framed on new principles, by God in His Providence, for that purpose?

Is not our one great business, external to ourselves, not war, not conquest, nor glory, but the Missionary Work? See how our one sea-front faces Europe and savage Africa. How, already, a home is prepared for the four millions of negroes that must pass away from this land. How the best and most earnest Christians are awakened to African Missionary enterprise. And Liberia is recognized, even now, by the ablest minds of Europe, as the most hopeful centre of Civilization and Christianization for Africa. Again, see how another sea-front looks toward South America, after Africa, the second savage continent.

And then along the greatest of Oceans, our third sea-front extends. To this last must the commerce of all the East Asiatic countries turn; China, and Birmah, and Hindustan, and all the Islands of the Indian Seas. And San Francisco, on the Pacific Ocean, its Western Emporium, St. Louis, its reservoir for supplying the whole Mississippi Valley with the produce of the East, and New York, its Atlantic depot for Europe, shall be the greatest cities of the world.

But, let History give us one more co-efficient of this great problem. Huge masses of population, the same in language, race and religion, dwell in one class of country only, regions that are level, wide-extended plains, undivided by mountains, united rather than separated, by the great Rivers that drain them. We have three or four of these upon the surface of the earth. What is Russia, but the great Sarmatian plain,

dwelt in for ages by the countless Slavon-race? What is China, with its three hundred millions of people, but the great plain, formed by the Valleys of its three great Rivers, a nation, as we see, that is one and inseparable? Now, take the region of the Mississippi States of the Gulf; it is one of these great plains. Far up in Minnesota, three thousand miles from the Gulf of Mexico, it is eight hundred feet above the level of the sea; in Louisiana, two hundred. A perfectly smooth and level floor, of an irregular shape, sixty feet long by sixty feet wide, will fairly represent it. In that region, there must dwell one people, of one blood, one Language, one Religion, and one Government. This is so, by all that we know of the world, of God's government, and of man's nature.

And that race, the center of the body politic of the United States, will certainly, within one hundred years, be an hundred and fifty millions; ultimately, in all probability, three hundred millions. No German, no Irish, no English, no Scotch, but all the Arian races massed together in one people, native-born, in the proportions of blood that has seemed best to the Almighty Governor of Nations; all Native Americans, having but one common feeling, to their one common land.

This central race, Western Men they are now called, the men of the Great Valley they shall be named, is framing itself, even now; forming its type from metal of all the Arian races. The man of the Great Valley is already shewing to the world what he will be. Look all along the River States, and the type of man is the same in all. From Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois, Ohio and Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi, Texas and Arkansas, three generations, born in the land, bring forth the same tall and muscular frame, without an ounce of fat, the same deep chest, broad shoulders, and long arms; the same high-centered head, with regular features; the same daring soul, overflowing with the most audacious courage, and gifted, furthermore, with coolness and caution, unmatched, save in the red Indian; the fire of the Frenchman, the doggedness and pertinacity of John Bull, and the calm steadiness of the Russian.\* We believe that God has reserved

\* That the uprising of the ultimate national type of the American people, in the  
VOL. XVII.

this New World, for this new race to be formed and framed in these latter days, that it may do a great work of happiness for itself internally as a nation, and a greater work without itself, of planting Christianity in the Islands of the Great Ocean, and on the great continent of Asia,—a mighty work, among mighty nations, to be done by a mighty instrument, which God has prepared for it.

We said that Christianity, after Constantine, became feeble. It lost very many of its grand ideas. The first of these was that of the Monarchia. The Church is the Spiritual Kingdom of God in this world; a real organized body, under its own laws and spiritual government and principles, actually and visibly existing. "We believe," said the old Christian Creed of the East, "in one God, the Father, the Sovereign of the Universe, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things, visible and invisible. And in *One Lord* Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, Light from Light, Very God from Very God, of one Being with the Father," &c.

The Spiritual Kingdom actually existing in the world as an organized, visible body,—Christ the King of His Church,—God from eternity, born of the Father,—man, in time, incarnate, and born of the Virgin upon earth,—ascended into

---

Great Valley, is already become evident to the world, may be seen by many indications. We give one; an extract from a correspondent in regard to the great Review at Washington of the armies of the late War. We may add, that in our opinion, the difference is not that of antagonism, as between English and Irish, or Russians and Italians, but of further progress toward perfection in the same type. The men of the Valley are simply becoming more rapidly what all Americans ultimately should be.

"Naturally, a comparison was made between the Eastern and Western troops. The Western men were taller, with fewer boys, and scarcely any foreigners among them. Their marching step was several inches longer, and yellow and red beards and light hair predominated. The officers of the Army of the Potomac conceded that they marched better. They moved with an elastic, swinging step, that does not belong to the Eastern boys, and their faces were more intelligent, self-reliant, and determined. One could not distinguish the officers from the men, except by the uniforms. The privates and officers seemed equal in intelligence and manly bearing. On the other hand, the Eastern troops showed more pure discipline and more drill.—There was a marked distinction in them between officers and men in point of culture."

Heaven,—God and man for ever more.—What mean these ideas and facts, placed side by side with the theory of Roman or Byzantine Imperialism or Feudal Aristocracy? These facts and truths,—they mean, which all men in this New World believe, that God alone is the King and Sovereign of the Earth. That all men, as brethren of our incarnate Lord, and purchased by His Blood, have an equal value, and are of an infinite price. That all men, therefore, have an equal right to justice, and kindness, and truth, and all those blessings and virtues, manifested in the Life of the God-man upon earth. Place our American ideas and principles upon these points of national and political principle, as they are professed by the mass of native Americans, side by side with those of the most cultivated and scientific Heathenism, say of Greek Philosophy or Roman Law, untouched by the influence of Christianity, and it will be plainly seen that they came from Christianity, from the New Testament and the Primitive Church, before the Union of Church and State by a despotic Emperor. They are the essential principles of Christianity before Constantine; principles which, when finally they come to be applied to National Politics, by the secret workings of God's Providence, in history, were stupidly called by the Roman or the Greek name, Republican or Democratic, but are really, Christian. All these principles, of equality and freedom, for the Man, the State, and the Church, Christianity lost by its union with the despotic Byzantine empire.

Again, the idea of an ultimate victory and conquest of the Church and the Gospel over the whole earth; that the Spiritual Kingdom shall finally embrace within it the whole world; that all the human Race shall confess, in Baptism, the Faith and principles of the Gospel;—an idea which is, in fact, absolutely necessary to Christianity, is indeed the basis of all Missionary zeal and progress;—this perished from Christian thought, or was transformed by heresy into a fanatical Millenarianism, and scorned and despised. And thus the Missionary Spirit of the Church failed within the Roman Empire of the East.

And yet, the doctrine that the Church of Christ should, in

the latter days, be victorious over the whole world, and that for a thousand years it should continue so to be, was, without doubt, the belief of the Christian Fathers, from the earliest day, down to the time of St. Augustine.\* In fact, it is distinctly laid down in Bishop Beveridge, one of the most learned and sober and judicious of the English Bishops, that it was a universal belief, in even the Jewish Church from the earliest times, that the world was to last seven thousand years, corresponding to the seven days of creation. The first two thousand years were to be without the Law ; the second two thousand, under the Law ; the third two thousand, under the Messiah. Then was to come the "Sabbath of the world," the thousand years of peace and rest. The primitive Fathers, one and all, held the same doctrine. With them, three thousand years are to be the "consummation of all things ;" "the final victory of the kingdom of Christ on earth." In this millennium, "Satan is to be bound for a thousand years."

We confess, that looking back upon Christianity, up to this time, we see no improbability in the doctrine. And looking upon this year as the eighteen hundred and sixty-fifth year from our Lord, leaving but one hundred and thirty-one years, until the last thousand years begin, we see it not an impossible thing, that a new era may be about to commence for the Christian Church, the era of its final victory and prevalence over the whole world ;—a Missionary era, whose main arena of strife and conquest shall be, over the nations of the greatest continent and the greatest ocean.

And we do not think it at all improbable, that this Country and this Church may have been prepared for this work, as the Roman, the Greek, the Syrian worlds and races, for their early work, for the Gospel. For we, as Christians, resolutely and clearly accepting the Faith, see no philosophy of history but this one, that before Christ, until His coming, all things prepared for the Advent of the Redeemer. And since His death, all movements in all nations are preparing for His final victory ; the reign of the Kingdom of Christ over the whole Earth.

Since the time of Constantine, all European Christianity has

---

\* Greswell on the Parables, Vol. I. p. 273, to the end. Vol. V. p. 67.



failed in respect to Asia and the Asiatic peoples. It is most pitiful to see what a difference between them and the Old Christianity. See the wretched paltering of the English East-India Company to Heathenism in Hindostan ! so sternly reproved by Buchanan fifty years ago. See the poor, feeble, partial efforts of the English since then. See how the Arabs, the noblest race in the world, have been left, by European Christianity, to Mohammed for twelve hundred years, and at this day, are almost untouched by the Gospel ! Look at the Persians ! Fifty years ago, Henry Martyn, great-hearted soul as he was, penetrated into Persia, saw what could be done there, translated the New Testament, and died a martyr to his holy Faith and zeal. Had he been the first Christian torch-bearer of the Gospel light in early days, a hundred would have followed him, and after them, ten thousand. And the great work of converting the nation would have been done. He died for the cause, and had no successor ! The same remark may be made as regards the Jesuit missions. Since Xavier started forth, they have had but one result. The tree has been planted, has grown, and flourished, until it seemed about to take possession of the whole nation ; and then, in all its vigor, it has been broken, struck down, and perished. So in Japan it has been, so in Paraguay, so in Hindostan.

It seems to us, that for the Christianizing of Asia, there only remain two nations to do the work ; ourselves, and Russia. For the Russian Church and Russian people we have, as Americans, the most hearty sympathy. We do most heartily thank them, that they alone, of the great nations of Europe, have sought to make no gain out of our great agony. They, alone, have not stood by, as the rest of our good European allies, grinning, with the most intense delight, at the prospect of a civil slaughter in this great land, that should last for one hundred years, and end in a military monarchy. They, alone, have sent forth no pirates, fully equipped, with native sailors ; have given no cannon from the royal stores ; have not encouraged and intrigued with the men who desired our ruin. Russia, alone, in this War, has acted right royally towards the United States, in the spirit of honesty, and honor, and truth.

There is not a man in the land that does not know it, and feel it. We wish, therefore, all happiness to Russia, in the State and in the Church. The Church of Russia, no doubt, has a great work in Asia to do.

And not less, we believe, has our own National Church. With the same principles and interests, also, only State-free,—the Holy Scriptures open to all men,—the pure Nicene and Apostolic Creeds,—the Apostolic Church, in its Three-fold Ministry, and a primitive and holy missionary life and zeal,—free, also, as the Russian Church is, from all the curses of European Christianity, its Popery, its Calvinism, its Rationalistic Lutheranism, its Zwinglianism.

We anticipate this great nation's growth towards the Eastern Ocean and Asia. We anticipate the progress of the Church, especially in the Great West, and then our ultimate Missionary work on the greatest of Continents and the greatest of Oceans. It will come, naturally, easily, and quietly, in its time, and we, as a Church and a people, must look out, most assuredly, for its coming. For the work that God has intended to be done upon the earth will, most certainly, be done. And if those into whose hands it is first given fail, from the most unexpected regions, even from lands unknown and unpeopled, He will raise up the proper instruments.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL. By EDWARD HAROLD BROWNE, D. D., Lord Bishop of Ely. First American from the Fifth English Edition. Edited with Notes by J. WILLIAMS, D. D., Bishop of Connecticut. New York: H. B. Durand. 1865. 8vo., pp. 871.

At length Mr. Durand has given to American Churchmen, and especially to the Clergy and Theological Students, the work which has so long been promised. Published about ten years ago, in the form of Lectures, when the Bishop was Divinity Professor at Cambridge, the work has already reached a fifth edition in England, and has been adopted as a text-book in most English and Colonial Theological Colleges. After an Introduction of about a dozen pages, mostly historical, the author states the main design of the work, which is "to interpret and explain the Articles of the Church, which bind the consciences of her Clergy, according to their natural and genuine meaning; and to prove that meaning to be both Scriptural and Catholic." Valuable as this elaborate treatise will prove to all, there are two classes of persons who may derive special benefit from it; those who persist in attributing to the Thirty-Nine Articles a Calvinistic origin and signification; and those who, with Romish proclivities on certain points, subscribe to the Articles in a non-natural sense. The first class of such persons the Bishop proves to be most certainly mistaken; the second he convicts of downright dishonesty. The author supposes that the Articles, to be signed by all the Clergy, should be, like the Church herself, comprehensive and Catholic, admitting of a certain degree of diversity of interpretation, while yet there is firm "adherence and conformity to those great Catholic truths which the primitive Christians lived by and died for." The Articles, as the author shows, have this character. Much as they have been disparaged by some among us, it is yet certain, as the learned Dr. Jarvis said of them, in his "No Union with Rome,"—"The Articles drawn up with wonderful precision, exhibiting a consummate knowledge of Catholic antiquity, and a most acute and practised skill in the subtleties of scholastic theology, we know not whether most to admire their learning, acumen, or moderation. They neutralize and render harmless every extravagance of opinion." Prepared when Romish corruption had become intolerable, and when Private Judgment had given birth to a swarm of metaphysical subtleties and false interpretations of Scripture, the Articles were finally matured, after nearly thirty years of deliberation and discussion, upon a basis which cannot be overthrown.

This characteristic of Bishop Browne's Exposition, its proof that the Thirty-Nine Articles of the English Church herself are truly Catholic, is one of its marked features. An intelligent Roman priest in India, "Father Felix," sat down to refute the book, and was himself converted by it to true Catholicity, and is now doing a good work for the Primitive Church, among the Romish priests and laity in Sicily, and in the employ of the Venerable Society.

In the plan of this work, the Bishop prefixes to his exposition of each Article a historical sketch of the Doctrine of the Article; and, brief as the statement necessarily is, there is not a prominent error in the primitive or modern Church pertaining to the Doctrine of the Article, which is not noticed. These historical portions of the work are exceedingly important and valuable. With the aid of full references in the foot-notes, they enable the reader to pursue the investigation to his abundant satisfaction. For example, the historical treatises on the Articles "Of Original or Birth-Sin," "Of Free Will," "Of the Justification of Man," "Of Sin after Baptism," "Of Baptism," "Of the Lord's Supper," brief as they are, comprise an amount of information which cannot be found elsewhere within the same compass. The Second Section under each Article gives compactly the Scripture proof of the Doctrine contained in the Article. While there are expressions in the work which we would not use, yet its tone is throughout true and firm, and its language always kind and considerate. The Notes of the American Editor, Bishop Williams, though few and brief, add essentially to the value of the volume, and his strong endorsement of it, after many years of use in the instruction of his own theological students, is recommendation sufficient to give it that general circulation which it deserves.

**HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.** By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. I. and II. Small 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865. pp. 447, 501.

This James A. Froude was brother to Richard H. Froude, whose name appeared so prominently in the earlier stages of the Oxford Tract movement, and whose death occurred before that movement reached its crisis. The personal career of the two Froudes is, in many respects, a counterpart to that of the two Newmanes. Richard H. Froude did not live to follow John Henry Newman to Rome, and James Anthony Froude never went as far as Francis W. Newman in bold and barefaced infidelity; yet his "*Nemesis of Faith*," as our readers will remember, and which appeared in 1849, was a thoroughly bad book, and was almost as mischievous as Newman's book on the Soul. It was a book which revealed the religious character of the man, his beliefs and his unbeliefs, his struggles and his doubts, and his despairs. Driven by his own perturbed spirit, first from faith in the Bible, and then from faith in the Church, from the cold intellectualism of mere Protestantism, and from the mechanical belief of Romanism, he finally sought refuge in the reckless sneering cynicism of Carlyle.

Yet the wail of anguish which he sent up as the conclusion of his search, showed that he had not, and, in such a haven, could not find, that rest which he sought. Aside from other external causes, there was, and is, a radical defect in the man's mind, which is the secret of his former book, the "*Nemesis of Faith*," and which characterizes thoroughly and constantly the History of England, of which the two first Volumes are now before us. The author lacks faith in God, faith in man, faith in virtue. He seems to see in Religion, whether in the Church, the State, or the Family, only one ever-present sham. The only really ruling principle, which he seems to believe in, is sheer selfishness.

We have drawn this portrait of the man, that we may be prepared to read aright his History of that most stirring and eventful period, which he has made the subject of his elaborate work,—the Early Years of the English Reformation. It appeared in England in eight volumes, and has already reached its fourth edition. He has had access to authorities not hitherto used by any historian. The complete collection of the State Papers of the reign of Henry VIII, only a portion of which were accessible to Lingard, were placed in his hands. Sir Francis Palgrave, also, gave him the use of a large manuscript collection of copies of Letters, Minutes of Councils, Theological Tracts, Parliamentary Petitions, Depositions of Trials, &c. &c., all relating to that period of the Reformation. Mr. Froude writes with unquestionable power. As a historian he has great faults and great excellencies. He knows nothing of generalizations. He seems incapable of comprehending the philosophy of History, those broad and comprehensive views where events are read alike in their remote causes and their ultimate results. In this respect, he is most unlike the better class of historians, as Hume and Hallam. He holds only to the "individualizing theory" of History; and his glowing, lively, sparkling pages, are a series of historical portraits, or vivid descriptions of prominent events. These two volumes are wholly taken up with the times of Henry VIII. The author boldly attempts to reverse the popular judgment of that monarch, whom he defends, eulogizes, and almost idolizes. He sometimes not only shocks our prejudices, if we have any, but contradicts our matured estimates of certain prominent national events; and not unfrequently he fights vigorously a mere man of straw, which he himself has set up. Being what Dr. Johnson calls "a good hater," he dashes into that field of fierce controversy, as the old knights rushed into the tournament. And yet, indeed, for these very reasons he is worth reading. In depicting the actors and the motives of that great era, the English Reformation, as it affected Society, the Church and the State, we place not the slightest confidence in his opinion or judgment; his facts—if they are facts—we are bound to account for.

We have said enough by way of introduction, to a work which Messrs. Scribner & Co. are re-publishing, with their accustomed liberality and good taste, and which will of course be extensively read.

**SOCIAL STATICS**, or the Conditions Essential to Human Happiness Specified, and the First of them Developed. By HERBERT SPENCER, Author of "Illustrations of Progress," "First Principles," &c. &c.; with a Notice of the Author, and a Steel Portrait. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1865. 12mo., pp. 523.

Perhaps we ought to thank both the author and the publishers for this book. Not because it is a good book;—far from it. It is a very bad book; but it is a good *Refutation* of a "Development" or "Evolution" Philosophy, of which its author is the founder. We thought that we had given a pretty satisfactory refutation of that Philosophy, in our two articles on the subject, in the October and January Nos. of our Review. But nothing that we have said, and nothing that any man has said or can say, could so completely and so effectually refute his Philosophy, as this exposition of its practical bearings, by the author himself.

Although this volume was written before "*the First Principles*," it is issued since that was written; and with the assurance by the author, that "he adheres to the leading principles set forth,"—"though not prepared to abide by all the detailed applications of them." The principles of action set forth in this volume, must therefore be accepted as the legitimate result of the Evolution-Philosophy; and such a *reductio ad absurdum* was never before presented to the world! A Moral and Political Philosophy, which leaves each individual, or any two or more, at liberty to go into any amount of sensual indulgence or gratification; which abolishes all authority in the family of the husband over the wife, and of parents over the children; and teaches that in the State every individual has the right "to ignore the State," to "secede from it," and that "*all coercion*," whether in the family or in the State, whether designed to restrain self-willed children in the family, or thieves, burglars and murderers in the State, or to punish them for the wrongs they may have done, or the crimes they may have committed, or even for the purpose of preventing them from committing, "*is immoral*," and wrong—is certainly no commendation of the "*First Principles*" on which it is founded; or rather, we should say, is their sufficient refutation. And yet, such are "the leading principles" set forth in the book before us, sanctioned by the author, Nov., 1864.

There is one other feature of this book to which we call attention. Our author is set against all poor rates, or other means of support for the poor, except such as the benevolent may willingly and unsolicited give. And it is doubtful whether he would have even this relief very plentifully supplied. We quote the following as a sample, and to avoid all possibility of doing the author injustice. He says, p. 354: "It seems hard, that an unskillfulness which, with all his efforts, he cannot overcome, should entail hunger upon the artisan. It seems hard, that a laborer, incapacitated by sickness from competing with his stronger fellows, should have to bear the resulting privations. It seems hard, that widows and orphans should be left to struggle for life or death. Nevertheless, when regarded not separately, but in connection with the interests of universal humanity, these harsh fatali-



ties are seen to be full of the highest beneficence—the same beneficence which brings to early graves the children of diseased parents, and singles out the low-spirited, the intemperate, and the debilitated, as the victims of an epidemic.” And this is the way in which “the stern discipline, which we see at work through all nature, is a little harsh that it may be very kind.”

No doubt, as the author says, “there are many very amiable people who have not the nerve to look this matter fairly in the face.” We confess ourself to be of the number; and most devoutly do we pray that we may ever continue to be so. And in speaking of the entire class of “unfortunates,” whether “widow and orphans in the distress of poverty and destitution, the sick and lame, the insane and idiotic,” he says, let them alone and “they die; it is best they should die;” it is but a “part of that process” by which “nature is weeding out those of lowest development.” In this way, as he holds, “nature is securing the growth of a race” which “shall both understand the conditions of existence and be able to act up to them.” “Unquestionably,” says he, “there is harm done when sympathy is shown” to these unfortunate persons. Nay, he characterizes those who do such things as “sigh-wise and groaning-foolish” people, who would “bequeath to posterity a constantly growing curse.”

Let it, however, be understood, that we regard these conclusions as resulting rather from the Philosophy that underlies the Evolution-theory, and which Spencer has assumed as a means of setting it forth and explaining it, than from that theory itself. As we have already said, in the articles referred to, we have no objection to the Evolution-theory, regarded as a high generalization of Science, and as a *divine method*; provided only it recognizes God as a Creator, a Sustainer, and a Providence interposing in nature’s course and working out, through its changes and evolutions, moral and spiritual ends. And we have endeavored to show, in the articles referred to, that the system is absurd without such a recognition of something out of, and above, the mere process and subject matter of the Evolution.

We close this notice with saying again, that we thank the author for giving us in advance such a frank and full exposition of the principles to which, in the practical departments of life, his “New Philosophy” may be expected to lead. No sensible person will be slow in accepting the inference that in any system which leads to such results, there must be something that is radically and fundamentally wrong. And that which is wrong in this case, is, manifestly, the Atheism,—the denial of the personality of God, and the fact that He has made a special Revelation of His will in the Bible; and that other equally important fact—He exercises a Moral Government over His rational creature man. This, however, pertains to Mr. Spencer’s *theory* of “Evolution” and “Universal Progress,” rather than to the *fact* of such an Evolution or Progress; and hence, can never be inferred or proved, by any amount of facts or illustrations that may be adduced to prove the fact itself.



LIFE OF MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO. By WILLIAM FORSYTH, M. A., Q. C. Author of "Napoleon at St. Helena, and Sir Hudson Lowe," &c., &c. In two Volumes, with Illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865. Small 8 vo. pp. 364, 341.

Cicero is known mostly among the great mass of educated men by the few Orations of his which have come down to us, and which will always be read as a classic, for the purity of their Latinity, and the almost matchless beauty of their style. Mr. Forsyth, with the aid of rather scanty materials, has prepared a very agreeable, and, to scholars, instructive volume, giving us all that is capable of being known of the early, private, and domestic life and education, of this really great man.

But Cicero has another claim upon the attention of thinking men now;—a claim which gives, not only to his Orations, but to his conduct and character, the very deepest interest. He lived at that terrible period, the down-fall of the Roman Republic; and he was a leading actor amid the scenes of that bloody drama. He loved the Constitution and the Republic, and he sealed his devotion with his blood. He was, we think, more of an orator and a rhetorician, than a statesman; yet he was a true patriot; and the great weakness of his character was, in that he did not, and could not, appreciate, in all its enormity, and its weakness, the deep moral and social corruption of the times in which he lived. The portrait which Louis Napoleon has drawn of Cicero, in his History of Julius Cæsar, should be studied in connection with this Life of Cicero, by Mr. Forsyth. Napoleon praises Cæsar, at the expense of Cicero. Cicero loved his country too well to become a tool to the ambition of an unprincipled despot. Despotism triumphed, because national virtue was lost. The Life of Cicero, from the time when, at the age of thirty-one he was elected Quæstor, down to his assassination, was so closely identified with the history of the Republic itself, that it has more than a personal interest and importance. The sketch of the Catiline Conspiracy, for example, in connection with which Cicero played so active and noble a part, and in which his policy contrasted so strangely with that of Julius Cæsar, as to the punishment due to the leading conspirators, is full of meaning to us, as American Republicans, at the present day. Is history to repeat itself, here and now? Read the story of the bribes, the embezzlements, the perjuries, the social corruptions at Rome, and then let the answer be given. The only question is, whether there is public virtue left among us sufficient to save the Republic.

The enterprizing publishers, Messrs. Scribner & Co., deserve the thanks of the reading public, for the large number of really valuable books which they are constantly issuing, as well as for the neat and substantial style in which their works appear. Next to the luxury of a good book, is the dress in which it is clothed. The volumes before us, without being finical, will suit the most fastidious.

THE ILIAD OF HOMER, rendered into English blank Verse. By EDWARD, Earl of Derby. In two volumes, 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865. pp. 430, 457.

A new translation of the Iliad of Homer in English verse, needs no apology to those who know the history of previous attempts in this line of scholarship. Pope's grandiloquent and glowing pages fail to give the spirit and meaning of the original, simply from his want of thorough acquaintance with the language, and his reliance on a French translation; while Cowper, though more faithful to his author, is dull and tame, and is now almost universally neglected. The Earl of Derby, encouraged by a previous effort at translation of Ancient Poems, which included the first Book of the Iliad, has now finished the entire work. It is an "attempt to infuse into an almost literal English version, something of the spirit, as well as the simplicity, of the great original." In his Preface, he gives his reasons why he has adopted the "Heroic blank verse, and has avoided that 'pestilent heresy of the so-called English Hexameter.'" While our Greek scholars, and those who keep fresh by constant reading their knowledge of that language, will of course go to the pages of Homer himself; yet many, as we believe, will be glad to welcome this translation of the Iliad. The translator, himself a fine scholar, a man of severe taste, and England's great, perhaps greatest orator, has found in the great poet of antiquity a theme worthy of his best efforts. He has re-produced Homer, with all his wonderful genius and versatility, more faithfully than any translator before him. The speeches of the great actors in the drama, Ulysses, and Nestor, and Agamemnon, and Achilles, are given with wonderful fidelity and power. We need not urge to the study of Homer, the Shakespeare of antiquity, the great uninspired poet of the world, the man whom Sophocles, and Euripides, and Plato, and Aristotle, and Cicero, and Virgil, hailed as their master. Besides, there was more in Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, than the mere story of the wars of gods and goddesses, and the strifes of earthly heroes. They know little of Homer, who do not read in his immortal poems a great meaning, higher and deeper than all this.

Such a work as this, from the Earl of Derby, and the "Studies of Homer and the Homeric Age," from such a man as Mr. Gladstone, are fruits of English scholarship worthy of all praise. Surely a nation is not in the decrepitude of age and decay, when her noblest statesmen seek relief from the cares and labors of public life, in such diversions as these.

HISTORY OF JULIUS CÆSAR. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 463. 1865.

The real object of Louis Napoleon in writing this History, he himself avows, in the following words:—"This aim is to prove that, when Providence raises up such men as Cæsar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon, it is to trace out to peoples the path they ought to follow;

to stamp with the seal of their genius a new era; and to accomplish in a few years the labor of many centuries. Happy the peoples who comprehend and follow them! Wo to those who misunderstand and combat them! They do as the Jews did, they crucify their Messiah; they are blind and culpable; blind, for they do not see the impotence of their efforts to suspend the definitive triumph of good; culpable, for they only retard progress, by impeding its prompt and fruitful application.

"In fact, neither the murder of Cæsar, nor the captivity of St. Helena, have been able to destroy, irrevocably, two popular causes, overthrown by a league which disguised itself under the mask of liberty. Brutus, by slaying Cæsar, plunged Rome into the horrors of civil war; he did not prevent the reign of Augustus, but he rendered possible those of Nero and Caligula. The ostracism of Napoleon by confederated Europe, has been no more successful in preventing the Empire from being resuscitated; and, nevertheless, how far are we from the great questions solved, the passions calmed, and the legitimate satisfactions given to peoples by the first Empire?"

We have given this extract entire, because it is the key to the whole work. It shows the design of the author in writing, and it is the gloss by which the work itself is to be interpreted throughout. We are not among the number of those who worship at the shrine of either of the Napoleons. We believe that there is a God in History; but we do not *therefore* believe that Providence sanctions and approves any and all of the designs and measures of men whom God allows to appear upon the stage of human events, as His scourges, His instruments to accomplish His wise and beneficent ends. The Cæsars and Napoleons are not, always, and of necessity, "Messiahs;" as Louis Napoleon so blasphemously would teach us; nor is it either "blind," or "culpable," for the "peoples" to ask for their proper credentials, before they will be quite ready to bow down their faces to the earth, and to be trampled in the dust by every military despot who may be able to ride into power for a little while on the storms of public anarchy. Napoleon III. seems to forget that Napoleon I. was the "man of destiny" at St. Helena, as truly as when Europe trembled at his name. If the Empire of Cæsar, restored to his nephew, lasted for five hundred years, it does not follow that the Empire of Napoleon I., restored by his nephew, Napoleon III., is to last for an equal period. To show that this does not follow, or rather to show that this is a wild and an impious delusion, and that the indications of Providence all point in a different direction, would not be a difficult task. But this is not the place for such an exposition.

The Emperor has been gathering materials for such a work for ten years. Aside from his ambition to shine in the world of letters, he undoubtedly seeks, in this History, to establish himself and his Empire in the confidence of the civilized world. He greatly mistakes the spirit of the age in which he lives, however. if he hopes to escape the sober, candid, searching judgment of those who, as he will find, are more than his peers in the realm which he has now presumed to enter. *Non omnia possumus omnes.* The style of the work is open

to the severest criticism; but how much of this is due to the original, and how much to the translation, we cannot now determine. The enterprising publishers, who have the honor of presenting the work to the American people, have done it in the most appropriate style, and in a manner worthy of royalty itself.

**HISTORY OF THE ROMANS UNDER THE EMPIRE.** By CHARLES MERIVALE, B. D. Late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. From the Fourth London Edition. With a copious analytical Index. Vol. VII. New York: D Appleton & Co. 1865. 8vo. pp. 569.

The present volume reaches over a period of a little more than a hundred years,—from the accession of Vespasian, A. D., 71, to the death of Marcus Aurelius, A. D., 180. Hoping soon to review this entire and noble work, or rather, to present certain phases of Roman Civilization, which the author discloses to us, in their connections with and bearing upon that higher and divine element which was so soon to appear upon the stage, and play its part in this great drama of the world's history, we will not leave this concluding volume of Mr. Merivale, without once more asking attention to this new contribution which the author has made to our standard literature. His charming style, the ease with which he moves among the mighty elements of power at that great epoch, his felicity in narrative, his tact in analysis and discrimination, his calmness, and the impartiality of his conclusions, his unity of plan of which he seems never to lose sight, in the multiplicity of detail,—all this renders his pages most attractive and satisfactory to the reader. We wish that he had, as he at first intended, continued his narrative, until he had presented before us the Religion of the God-man, enthroned as the ruling element at Rome. He might, at least, have shivered to atoms the unfairness and sophistry of Gibbon's famous fifteenth and sixteenth Chapters. But he leaves off where Gibbon begins. The Analytical Index, at the end of the volume, is very full, and is of course invaluable.

**TRAVELS IN CENTRAL ASIA:** Being the account of a Journey from Teheran across the Turkoman Desert, on the Eastern Shore of the Caspian to Khiva, Bokhara, and Samarcand, performed in the year 1863, by ARMINIUS VAMBERY, Member of the Hungarian Academy of Pesth, by whom he was sent on this scientific mission. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 8vo. pp. 493.

The author, a Hungarian, impelled by a love of linguistic science,—already master of several European and Asiatic languages,—determined to ascertain whether the Hungarian language is to be referred to the Finnish or Tartaric branch of the Altaic stock. To decide that question, which of course is not one touching philology alone, he spent several years at Constantinople, a resident in Turkish houses, and a frequent visitor of Islamite Schools and Libraries, until, he says, he was transformed into a Turk, nay, into an effendi, or civil functionary. Further to prosecute his researches, he resolved to visit Central Asia, a task of no small difficulty, where, as he says, "to

hear, is regarded as impudence, to ask, as crime, and to take notes, as a deadly sin." At length, at Teheran, and while enjoying the hospitalities of the Turkish embassy, he fell in with a company of Tartars, of more than ordinary respectability, who were on their return to Turkestan, or Central Asia, and whom, though with difficulty, he persuaded to take him under their protection. They regarded him as a dervish, and he, acting on the suggestion, assumed the garb and profession of that order; though his European features and complexion were a constant source of suspicion and annoyance to him. The device, however, succeeded. Starting from Teheran, the capital of Persia, skirting the eastern coast of the Caspian Sea, his course was taken, eastwardly, through the fearful Turkoman desert, to Bokhara and far-famed Samarcand, thence southwardly to Herat, in Afghanistan, and westwardly, through Persia to Teheran again.

Reserving his philological conclusions for a future volume, he gives, in this, a sketch of his hazardous journey, and also much information concerning the geography, statistics, politics, and social relations of Central Asia, a region hitherto almost wholly unknown to us. He is evidently not only a scholar, but a clear-headed, observant man; and his work is full of interest. He alludes, though briefly, to what we are quite certain the English will afterwards hear more of, the constantly advancing progress of Russian influence in this region. The three khanats of Turkestan, Khiva, Bokhara, and Khokand, unreached as yet by modern civilization, and for reasons which the author describes, will present *abundant* temptations and occasions for a trial of strength, by and by, between the British Lion and the Russian Bear. The volume abounds in very good illustrations; and an excellent map helps the reader to trace the route of Mr. Vambéry, through this hitherto unexplored country.

SERMONS OF REV. C. H. SPURGEON. Preached at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, London. Eighth Series. New York: Sheldon & Co, 1865. 12mo. pp. 372.

Mr. Spurgeon has his uses, undoubtedly. Among these, aside from his direct spiritual influence on the souls of men, and this we do not consider or estimate now, must be mentioned the terrible and yet deserved severity with which he lashes certain Church Clergymen, who have long been in the habit of hanging around him. Because they do not agree with him on Baptism, and because they subscribe to, and use the Baptismal Service of the Prayer Book, he says, "they believe one way and swear another;" and he says, as they "get their livings by subscribing to words asserting it, let them find congenial associates among men who can equivocate and shuffle, for honest men will neither ask nor accept their friendship." Now, such language is at least ungenerous and exceedingly unkind; but, we repeat, it is justly merited. His Sermon on Baptismal regeneration, he makes the occasion of a bitter, even savage attack on the English Church and Establishment. There is not even a show of argument in his violent phillipic, and as for solid learning, he is not capable of it; but, he pours out his billingsgate

without measure. "Away," he cries, "from all the tag-rags, wax-candles, and millinery of Puseyism! away from all the gorgeous pomp of Popery! away from the founts of the Church of England!" Attributing his own high-Calvinistic theory of Regeneration to the Prayer-Book, he bawls and raves like a fishwoman. In another of his Sermons, on "Thus saith the Lord," he rails at the Ordination Service of the Church. "Fresh from the dissipations of College-life," he says, "the sinner bows before the man in lawn, and rises a full-blown priest, fully able to remit or retain sins." . . . . . "And what, think you, sirs, must be the curse that fills the mouth of damned souls, when in another world they meet the priest who absolved them with this sham absolution!" And yet, such stuff as this is greedily swallowed by the thousands who hang with admiring wonder upon the lips of the great ranter. As one says, "it is the boldness of the argument, not the argument itself, that knocks them down." "The very wind of the shot, so to speak, prostrates all the fools in the neighborhood." We have at least one counterpart to such pulpit exhibitions on this side of the Atlantic.

There is a certain sort of talent and eloquence in Spurgeon; but strip his language of its egotism, and vulgarity, and irreverence, and ferocity, and he sinks to the level of a common-place declaimer. We began by saying that Spurgeon has his uses. Another of these is, in an illustration of the power which earnestness and directness give the preacher in the pulpit. The great mass of his hearers feel, "now we have a man before us who is no sham; this man does not *play* preaching; there is no perfunctory professional routine in all this." In these respects, and in others, the Sermons are a curiosity and a study, and are worth examining. Especially is the volume noteworthy, as showing the fierce determination and bitterness of spirit with which the Church of England is now forced to contend. Again and again we have been reminded, also, that this same opposition to the English Church has its answering voice on this side the Atlantic, and just in proportion as the Church here is waking to her duties and opportunities.

A TREATISE ON ASTRONOMY. By ELIAS LOOMIS, LL. D., Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy in Yale College, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 8vo. pp. 338.

A man may be a good scholar, and yet a poor teacher. So, also, he may be but an indifferent scholar, and yet be a very successful teacher. The simple elements of Science he may teach to a class of ordinary students, even better than a man who stands on a much higher level; just as, in traffic, it does not require large capital to do a very considerable retail business. Professor Loomis is both a true scholar and a successful teacher. His works, heretofore published, and occasional papers on subjects purely scientific, prove him to be, in his department, one of the most scholarly men of the country; while his text-books for Schools and Colleges are already largely adopted by many of our very best teachers. This treatise on Astron-



omy is designed for the instruction of College classes, and to follow his "Introduction to Practical Astronomy," a work which we have already noticed. It supposes the student to be already master of the elementary principles of Mathematics. It also treats more fully than is usual on certain physical phenomena; as the constitution of the sun, the condition of the moon's surface, the phenomena of total eclipses of the sun, the laws of tides, and the constitution of comets. The work is illustrated by charts, plates, and cuts.

ST. WINIFRED'S; or the World of School. New York: W. H. Kelley and Brother. 1865. 12mo. pp. 411.

As yet, we Americans know very little of the phases of School-life, which this volume so admirably describes; and simply, because we have very few Primary and Training Schools, which have force enough in them to impress character on the lads who are sent to them. The English Training School, represented by St. Winifred's, is an institution. It is a little world of itself. It has its own customs and internal regulations; its secret police and codes of laws; its little cliques and coteries; its petty despotisms and despots; its victims and martyrs; its heroes and sneaks. School-life, in the best English Schools, is a reality. It makes men. It does not send out snobs. But it is a terrible crucible; it not unfrequently breaks the spirit and ruins the prospects of many a fair, delicate, noble boy, who has not the brute courage to meet the rough usage to which he is exposed. St. Winifred's, which is somewhat in the vein of "Tom Brown" at Oxford," and "School-Days at Rugby," illustrates the varied phases of School-life; and is a good book for both pupils and teachers. It ought to rid these Schools of some of the villainous evils which cling so persistently to them.

VANITY FAIR. A Novel without a Hero. By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. With Illustrations by the Author; and a Portrait on Steel, engraved by Halpin, after Lawrence's Picture. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. Three Volumes, post 8vo. pp. 350, 354, 346.

The warmest admirers of Thackeray will be quite satisfied with the beautiful style in which the Messrs. Harper have issued this one of the most popular of Thackeray's works. The neat, clean type, the toned paper, the very fine Portrait, and the Illustrations, which are, as they should be, the creatures of the Author's own odd and quaint designs, are all that could be desired. Thackeray has more readers in the United States than in his own country, and the best English writers are already learning to find their most appreciative and most liberal supporters on this side the Atlantic. With the already large importation of foreign literature, and which is likely greatly to increase hereafter, the press of this country are bound to the expression of a criticism at once just, but bold and independent, thoroughly untrammelled by the conventionalities which belong to, and are the growth of, another kind of institutions. In the republic of



letters, as well as of government, there is but one sure way to secure respect. We understand that all Thackeray's works, Novels, Lectures, Histories, &c., are to be issued in the same sumptuous manner as *Vanity Fair*, including some Sketches, &c., which have never appeared in this country.

SCIENCE FOR THE SCHOOL AND FAMILY. Part III. Mineralogy and Geology. By WORTHINGTON HOOKER, M. D. Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in Yale College. &c. Illustrated by nearly two hundred Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 12mo. pp. 360.

The great excellence of Prof. Hooker's School books hitherto issued, is strikingly apparent in this treatise on Mineralogy and Geology. It is the clearness of his definitions, and the simplicity of his statements. With the aid of his illustrations, any intelligent person can readily put himself in possession of the elementary principles of both Mineralogy and Geology. In respect to Geology, to which this volume is mainly devoted, Dr. Hooker adopts the leading definitions of Prof. Dana, and draws largely, for his materials, upon that distinguished Naturalist's standard book, "*Manual of Geology*," a work which we cannot too strongly recommend to those who would pursue this Science thoroughly. As a thoroughly educated Physiologist, Dr. Hooker treats the "Development" theory of Darwin and Huxley, as such scientific quackery deserves. This volume is well adapted to family reading and to High Schools and Academies.

THE CARTOONS OF RAPHAEL. Engraved by G. GREATBACH, from the original at Hampton Court Palace, New York: London Printing and Publishing Company, H. A. Brown, Manager, 487 Broadway. 1865.

Raf  ello De Sanzio flourished in Rome, early in the sixteenth century. About A. D., 1514, Leo X. commissioned him to execute Cartoons, or full-sized drawings on paper, from which the Flemish art-weavers were to make tapestries, equal in merit to some already in the Vatican. Two sets of tapestries were made from these Cartoons; one for the Pope, the other for Henry VIII, who had not then quarreled with Rome. The original Cartoons of Raphael were twenty-five in number; of which, only seven remain; neglect, and like causes, have dispersed the others, probably beyond recovery. These seven, Charles I. employed Rubens to purchase for him in Brussels; and after their dispersion, during the Rebellion, Cromwell again purchased them for the British nation. Afterward, William III. had a gallery built for them at Hampton Court Palace, where they have since remained, among the most valuable and curious specimens of Ancient Art. Their subjects are, (1.) The Death of Ananias; (2.) Elymas, struck with blindness; (3.) St. Paul, preaching at Athens; (4.) The Sacrifice at Lystra; (5.) St. Peter, healing the Lame Man; (6.) CHRIST'S Charge to St. Peter; (7.) The Miraculous Draught of Fishes. Mr. Greatbach is one of the best Engravers in England,

and he has re-produced these fine pictures in a series of line engravings, forming one of the most artistical productions ever offered to the public. Accompanying the engravings is letter-press, consisting of a Memoir of Raphael, the quotation illustrated by, and descriptions of, each Cartoon. The plates are printed on fine paper, 17 by 12 inches, and are adapted to the port-folio, the drawing-room table, or for framing. The price of the set is \$10.00; a few sets of Artists Proofs are offered at \$15.00.

**CHRISTIAN POEMS.** By F. R. HOLEMAN, formerly Rector of Christ Church, Boonville, Mo. Published for the Author by the Claremont Manufacturing Co., Claremont, N. H. 12mo. 1865. pp. 227.

There is a fragrance of true devotion in these Poems; they are thoroughly Churchly in their subjects and tone, and the versification is always easy and flowing.

**METHOD OF PHILOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.** By FRANCIS A. MARCH, Professor of the English Language, &c., in La Fayette College, Easton, Pa. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 12mo. pp. 118.

We commend this unpretending little volume to the attention of teachers of English Composition in our best High Schools and Academies. Taking extracts from a few standard English authors, it subjects these to the most thorough analysis; questions, well chosen, are reiterated again and again; the student is required to think, to investigate, to write out results; and so, to become at once the full man, and the exact man. The author says, truly, such a method "quickens thought ninety-nine times as much as beating the brain for original brilliancies." The author has some valuable tables, showing the great preponderance of Anglo-Saxon words in the best composition. This is not only so in King James's Version of the Bible, and in Shakespeare, where the proportion is as great as ninety and ninety-six to a hundred, but also in the best modern authors,—Irving, Webster, Tennyson, Bryant and Longfellow, &c.

**PARSON AND PEOPLE.** Or Incidents in the Every-day Life of a Clergyman. By the Rev. EDWARD SPOONER, M. A., Vicar of Heston, Middlesex, England. From the Second London edition; With an Introduction, by an American Clergyman. New York: F. J. Huntington. 1865. 12mo. pp. 260.

We remind the "American Clergyman," under whose auspices this little book has been re-published, the Rev. Leonard Woolsey Bacon, a Congregationalist, that in his Introduction he has not over-estimated that great movement which is now going on in the very heart of the English Church. It has nothing to do with party; yet persons of all grades of Churchmanship are thoroughly engaged in it. The Kingdom of God has not come, in this instance, with observation. It sounds no trumpets; it has none of the popular windy flourishes from

platforms; it issues no flaming placards. Yet it is at work, quietly, resolutely, judiciously, and most effectually, among the vast multitudes of the poor, ignorant, suffering, and depraved of the great cities of England. "*Parson and People*" gives the details of such instrumentalities in a single and most successful instance. We thank Mr. Bacon for his tribute to what the Church of England is doing. It is in noble contrast with the treatment which the Mother and Daughter Churches have learned to expect from such sources. We wish he was in a position to lend his generous nature and effective influence to the same work, which is already inaugurated in this country to a much larger extent than he seems to be aware of.

**OUR VOWS: A Work** to be read in preparation for Baptismal Confirmation and the Eucharist. By the Rev. RICHARD LOWNDES, M. A., Vicar of Sturminster Newton, Dorsetshire. Revised, and adapted to use in the Church in the United States. New York: Church Book Society. 1865. 12mo. pp. 123.

The author designed this as a work to be read by the Pastor to, and with, his class of candidates for Confirmation and the Holy Sacraments, and consists of eight Chapters; in which is included the whole subject of Man's condition in his present relation to God, and the means and ordinances suited to, and appointed for that condition. Man under the Law, and Man under Grace; the subjective effect of the Fall; the nature of Regeneration; of Justification, Sanctification, and Conversion; of Repentance, Faith, and Obedience; the Eucharist,—these are the subjects which the author discusses, in a plain and familiar manner. The great principles of the work are thoroughly sound, and its faithful use, as contemplated by the author, must result in a more fitting preparation for, and proper reception of, the Sacraments of the Gospel.

**"HALLOWED SONGS."** A collection of the most popular Hymns and Tunes, both old and new, designed for prayer and social meetings, revivals, and family worship, and Sabbath Schools. By T. E. PERKINS, PHILIP PHILLIPS, and SYLVESTER MAIN. New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. 1865. 4to. pp. 256.

The music of this little volume is, as a whole, much better than the words. With here and there a really choice gem, many of the Hymns remind one of the snatches which used to be heard on the Negro plantations of the South, consisting of almost endless changes rung on a few words, with little connected meaning, or no meaning at all. For example, there is in this book a Hymn of five stanzas, containing forty lines. Twenty of these lines are a mere repetition of the line,—"*'Tis a wonder, a wonder, a wonder.*" While we are loth to criticise a work of such good intention, we do insist that one great end to be answered by Sacred Song, on every occasion, should be, to educate, elevate, and refine the feelings, rather than to minister to a merely sensuous emotionalism.

**A COMMENTARY ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.** By the Rev. W. DENTON, M. A. Edited and enlarged by the Rev. H. J. Fox, M. A. New York: Carlton and Porter. 1865. 16mo. pp. 208.

This Commentary on the Lord's Prayer, as prepared by the author, an English Church Clergyman, we judge, was a most excellent and valuable treatise. The American Methodist Editor, however, says, that in presenting it "to his own and sister Evangelical Churches," "he has taken some liberties with the text," omitting and modifying "expressions growing out of the author's relation to an intensely prelatial Church." He has also "made what he thinks will be regarded as useful additions." It is easy enough to track the American Editor throughout the volume, in the dilutions, and insipidities, and alterations and perversions, which are apparent. As an honest man, he has no right to take such a liberty with the thoughts, and arguments, and opinions, and literary labor of Mr. Denton, whose name at least should have been dropped from the work entirely; or else he should have indicated precisely what Mr. Denton is responsible for, and what belongs to the Methodist Mr. Fox. Public sentiment among us is too indifferent at such trifling with the literary reputation and doctrinal teaching of English authors, so common in this country.

**TRACT NUMBER NINETY.** Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty Nine Articles. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D. D. New York: H. B. Durand. 1865. 12mo. pp. 134.

We hear considerable surprise expressed at the republication among us, and especially just now, of the Tract which made so much mischief a few years ago; and also some curiosity evinced, to know under whose auspices, and at whose suggestion and responsibility, it now appears. We assure all such persons, that the question is not worth asking; and that the treatise itself is too thoroughly sophistical, dishonest, and unprincipled, to do any great amount of harm.

**A PASTORAL LETTER** to the Clergy of the Diocese of New York, from the Bishop, May, 1865. 8vo. pp. 21.

The howlings of anger with which this Pastoral is greeted by the radicals outside of the Church, shows how strong their expectations had become, and not without reason, of crushing the Church, and trampling upon her authority. Professing the greatest degree of liberality, the intolerance of this radicalism is relentless towards everything which will not bend the knee to its iron despotism. As this Pastoral has a history, and is one of the most important documents ever issued by an American Bishop, we purpose to speak of it more at length hereafter. It is worthy of the Bishop of New York, and will be hailed with grateful satisfaction by all true Churchmen, Clergymen and Laymen.

**BISHOP STEVENS'S MEMORIAL SERMON ON BISHOP BOONE.** Philadelphia: 1865. 8vo. pp. 63.

While Bishop Stevens has paid a beautiful tribute to the memory of his personal friend, Bishop Boone, he has, at the same time, elevated him in the respect of those who did not thoroughly know him; for Bishop Boone was no common man; and he has also presented an argument for the Mission to China, which is unanswerable. In many respects, it is a publication of permanent value.

PROCEEDINGS at the Thirty First Anniversary of the Bishop White Prayer Book Society, with the Annual Report of the Board of Managers, &c., &c. Nov. 27, 1864. Philadelphia: 1865. 8vo. pp. 44.

The Report presented, was prepared by the Rev. B. Wistar Morris, one of a Committee specially appointed and instructed to give a historical account of the Prayer Book in this country. The present Report is spoken of as introductory, and the first of a series. It gives a historical record of the use of the Prayer Book in this country down to the Revolution, and shows, incidentally, "what instrumentality it has had in the promotion and preservation of these United States." Mr. Morris records the use of the Prayer Book by Capt. Frobisher and his Companions, May 27, 1577, more than forty years before the landing from the May Flower. It was used in Capt. Frobisher's Company in 1578, by Rev. Mr. Wolfall, who celebrated the ordinances of the Church on the Continent, near the inlet to Hudson's Bay. It was habitually used by the Expedition under Sir Richard Grenville, which landed on the Island of Roanoke, June 26, 1585. This was thirty-five years before the May Flower. It was regularly used by the Colony which landed on the peninsula of James River, April 13, 1607. This was thirteen years before the May Flower. In 1605 the Cross was planted on the bank of the Penobscot, in Maine; and on the 9th of Aug., 1607, the Rev. Richard Seymour celebrated Divine Service in St. George's Island, off the Coast of Maine, and a Church was soon erected on the main land. This was thirteen years before the May Flower. The first Representative Civil Government on American soil, met in the old Jamestown Church, July 16, 1619, and its doings were hallowed by the ordinances of the Church. This was one year before the May Flower. The use of the Prayer Book is traced down to the well-known Services by the Rev. Mr. Duché in the Continental Congress, Sept. 7, 1774, and the Chaplaincy of Bishop White, appointed Dec. 23, 1776. Appropriate record is also made of the most acceptable use of the Prayer Book during our present Civil War. This Report would make a most excellent Tract for general distribution. It is minute in its details, and is written in an excellent spirit. A collection of such Tracts would form a most valuable volume, and Mr. Morris has all the materials to do such a service for the Church.

WORDS FOR THE PEOPLE. In Three Parts. Part I. Civil Government. Part II. Government of the United States. Part III. Social Duties. By ORIGEN. Hartford: Case, Lockwood & Co. 1865. 18mo. pp. 295.

This treatise is not so much an argument, as it is a didactic statement of the theory of the writer. It is in the form of theses; each Part containing about one hundred and seventy distinct propositions. The First Part treats of the origin and nature of Civil Government; the Second, of the construction of our own Government; and in the Third, the writer treats of the relations of Labor and Capital, to the well-being of Society. It is a thoughtful work, evidently by a layman, written in a Christian spirit; it contains some propositions, which, if not novel, are at least doubtful; but is full of good sense and practical wisdom. It is one of that class of works which are likely to be the fruit of our national troubles; and, for that reason, to be read with care and caution.

**A DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE of Approved Books, suitable for Parish Libraries and Sunday Schools.** Compiled by a Presbyter of the Diocese of Connecticut. New York: James Pott, 13 Cooper Union. 1865. 12mo. pp. 43.

This Catalogue does not contain books published by the Church Book Society, and has been prepared as an aid to the Clergy in making up a list of books for Sunday School and Parish Libraries; for which purpose it cannot but prove very useful. Mr. Pott, who is doing a good work for the Church, will furnish the Catalogues, on application, and also the books at a fair rate. We would have added somewhat to the list of solid and substantial works for Parish Libraries; and we think, also, that these should form a larger element than is ordinarily found, even in Sunday School Libraries. Educate the children of the Church to love really good books—books that are books.

**WOMAN'S MISSION IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** Report of a Committee on organizing the service of Christian Women. Philadelphia: King & Baird.

We advise all who have any heart for such service for Christ, to send for this Report, to William Welsh, Esq., Philadelphia.

**PAPERS OF THE RUSSO-GREEK COMMITTEE.** No. IV. Comparative Statement of Russo-Greek and Roman Catholic Doctrines. 8vo. pp. 16.

The present Paper, edited, with Notes, by the Rev. J. F. Young, Editor of the Russo-Greek Committee, is a reprint of an Article, written by the present Metropolitan of Moscow. Its perusal would prevent a great deal of very noisy and very silly talking.

**O MOTHER DEAR, JERUSALEM.** The Old Hymn. Its Origin and Genealogy. Edited by WILLIAM C. PRIME; Author of "Boat Life in Egypt and Nubia, &c." New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1865. 12mo. pp. 92.

It is a curious fact, that in quarters where it would least have been looked for, we see, occasionally, curiosity aroused and inquiry insti-



tuted, in respect to the literary and devotional wealth of what are termed "the Dark Ages." Dark as they were, yet the corruptions of Rome had not then been precipitated into stereotype form; and there was in the bosom of the Church a depth of learning and richness of piety which now and then startles and rebukes the self-conceit of this nineteenth century. A research into the origin of this famous old Hymn, "The New Jerusalem," has led Mr. Prime to give specimens of the old Latin Hymns of Hildebert, Bernard, and Peter Damiau; all of which we are glad to see, for many reasons. Mr. Prime proves that this Hymn, which, in English, has been commonly attributed to David Dickson, a Scotch Clergyman of the seventeenth century, certainly had a much earlier origin. The volume is very tastefully published; it is really a choice little *morceau*, and will sharpen the appetite of the reader for more from the same source.

THE SPIRIT OF MISSIONS. June, 1865. 8vo. New York: No. 17 and 19 Bible House.

We desire to call the special attention of the Laity of the Church to this publication, edited by the Secretaries of the Domestic and Foreign Board of Missions. Some new features have recently been given to the work, by which able papers, historical and statistical, on Missions, are published, and also Summaries of General Missionary Intelligence. The wide dissemination of this Monthly, as well as the CARRIER DOVE, would be an indication of a truly Missionary spirit among us, and a sure means of greatly promoting it. An Advertisement of these Periodicals may be found in our Advertising Circular.

The following publications have been received:

TONY BUTLER. A Novel. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 8vo. pp. 257.

CHRISTIAN'S MISTAKE. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 12mo. pp. 260.

UNCLE SILAS: A Tale of Bartram-Haugh. By J. S. LE FANU. Author of "Wylder's Hand," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 8vo. pp. 159.

LUTTRELL OF ARRAN. By CHARLES LEVER; Author of "Barrington," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 8vo. pp. 223.

KATE KENNEDY. A Novel. By the Author of "Wondrous Strange," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 8vo. pp. 114.

Rev. Dr. PECK'S DISCOURSES. Our Country. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1865. 12mo. pp. 300.

The Rt. Rev. BISHOP ODENHEIMER'S Sermon at the Consecration of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Coxé, Jan. 4, 1865, in Trinity Church, Geneva, N. Y.



Rt. Rev. BISHOP VAIL's Sermon, at the Consecration of the Chapel of Griswold College, Davenport, Iowa, Dec. 30, 1864.

Rev. G. M. HILLS' Sermon, in memory of the Rt. Rev. Bishop De Lancey, in St. Paul's Church, Syracuse, W. N. Y., May 14, 1865.

Rev. Dr. C. H. HALL's Sermon, on the assassination of President Lincoln, preached in the Church of the Epiphany, Washington City, D. C., April 19, 1865.

Rev. Dr. E. A. HOFFMAN's Sermon: The Martyr President: Preached in Grace Church, Brooklyn Heights, April 20th, 1865.

Rev. A. D. BENEDICT's Address: Our Nation's Sorrow: St. Luke's Church, Racine, Wis., April 19, 1865.

Rev. Dr. H. A. BOARDMAN's Sermon: The Peace-Makers: in the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, April 9th, 1865.

Rt. Rev. BISHOP LAY's Memorial of Alexis I. Dupont; re-printed by L. C. Wilmington, Del.

ST. JOHN LAND: a Retro-Prospectus. In two Letters, supposed to be written some years hence. By W. A. MUHLENBERG, 8vo. pp. 62.

REGISTER OF RACINE COLLEGE. Twelfth Year. 1864-5. Present number of Students in the College, 117.

TWENTIETH ANNUAL REPORT of the Executive Committee of the Prison Association of New York. 8vo. pp. 367.

THE NEW PATH: A Monthly Art-Journal. Vol. II., No. V. May 1865.

Journal of the Institute of Reward for Orphans of Patriots. Vol. I. No. I.

# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### ORDINATIONS.

#### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Betts, George C.	Talbot.	Mar. 12, 1865,	St. Mary's Nebraska City, Nebr'a.
Bellam, T. L.	Kemper,	June 11,	" Chapel, Nashotah Mission, Wis.
Duerr, J. W. C.	McIlvaine,	April 1,	" Trinity, Cleveland, Ohio.
Fullerton, Alex., Jr.	Odenheimer,	June 2,	" St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Fisk, —	Potter, H.	April 8,	" Christ, Bay Ridge, N. Y.
Gibson, George,	Kemper,	June 11,	" Chapel, Nashotah Mission, Wis.
Hargate, John,	Chase,	May 25,	" St. Paul's, Concord, N. H.
Harrison, Hall,	Chase,	May 25,	" St. Paul's, Concord, N. H.
Holbrook, Charles A.	Williams,	June 7,	" Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn.
Holly, Wm. Wells,	Williams,	June 7,	" Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn.
Hyde, Jos. William,	Potter, H.	April 8,	" Christ, Bay Ridge, N. Y.
Lusk, William,	Kemper,	May 14,	" Trinity, Fort Wayne, Wisconsin.
Magill, William J.	Williams,	June 7,	" Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn.
Peterson, John,	Potter, H.	June 9,	" St. Philips, New York City.
Pope, Wm. Cox,	Kemper,	June 11,	" Chapel, Nashotah Mission, Wis.
Rafter, Wm. W.	Kemper,	June 11,	" Chapel, Nashotah Mission, Wis.
Scripture, James O.	Eastburn,	May 17,	" Trinity, Boston, Mass.
Sellick, Charles M.	Williams,	Mar. 11,	" St. Paul's Norwalk, Conn.
Slafter, Carlos,	Eastburn,	May 17,	" Trinity, Boston, Mass.
Vernor, George,	Kemper,	June 11,	" Chapel, Nashotah Mission, Wis.
Whitney, George A.	Kemper,	June 11,	" Chapel, Nashotah Mission, Wis.

#### PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Allen, Henry F.	Eastburn,	Mar. 13, 1865,	St. Paul's, Boston, Mass.
" Applegate, Octav.	Potter, H.	Mar. 19,	" Grace, Brooklyn, N. Y.
" Aspinwall, J. H.	Potter, H.	April 8,	" Christ, Bay Ridge, N. Y.
" Atwill, Edw. R.	Potter, H.	April 1,	" St. Luke's, New York City.
" Boyle, John,	Potter, H.	April 1,	" St. Luke's, New York City.
" Brown, Geo. W.	Clark,	Mar. 3,	" Trinity, Pawtucket, R. I.
" Buckmaster, J. W.	Potter, H.	June 11,	" St. Barnabas, Irvington, N. Y.
" Chapin, C. Ingles,	Eastburn,	May 29,	" St. Luke's, Chelsea, Mass.
" Charles, Wm.	Kemper,	Mar. 12,	" Intercession, Steven's Point, Wis.
" Cooley, Benj. F.	Eastburn,	May 29,	" St. Luke's, Chelsea, Mass.
" Debrisay, Wm. A.	Williams,	Mar. 8,	" St. James', New London, Conn.
" Denham, George,	Eastburn,	May 29,	" St. Luke's, Chelsea, Mass.
" Duhring, H. L.	Stevens,	May 17,	" Swedes, Bridgeport, Penn.
" Duerr, J. W. C.	Bedell,	June 1,	" Ascension, New York City.
" Fitch, Wm. T.	Elliott,	Apr. 21, 1864,	" St. James', Marietta, Ga.
" Gilliat, Chas. G.	Williams,	Mar. 8, 1865,	" St. James', New London, Conn.
" Goodridge, Edward,	Williams,	Mar. 8,	" St. James', New London, Conn.
" Locke Geo. L.	Eastburn,	May 29,	" St. Luke's, Chelsea, Mass.
" Lusk, Wm., Jr.	Upfold,	June 8,	" St. Paul's, Richmond, Indiana.
" Murray, Chas. E.	Stevens,	May 17,	" Swedes, Bridgeport, Penn.
" Pearce, J. Sturgis,	Williams,	Mar. 8,	" St. James', New London, Conn.

Rev. Potter, E. N.	Potter, A.	Mar. 19, 1865,	Holy Communion, New York City.
" Reeves, Abraham,	Upfold,	June 8,	" St. Paul's, Richmond, Indiana.
" Schouler, Wm.	Chase,	May 24,	" St. Andrews, Hopkinton, N. H.
" Sears, Lorenzo,	Williams,	Mar. 8,	" St. James', New London, Conn.
" Sherman, H. M.	Williams,	Mar. 8,	" St. James', New London, Conn.
" Sweet, Richard F.	Kemper,	Mar. 8,	" St. Mark's, Beaver Dam, Wis.
" Tompkins, E. D.	Potter, H.	April 8,	" Christ, Bay Ridge, N. Y.
" Webb, S. H.	Clark,	April 27,	" St. Paul's, N. Providence, R. I.
" Yocum, Thos. S.	Stevens,	May 17,	" Swedes, Bridgeport, Penn.

## CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	Bishop.	Time.	Place.
Christ,	McIlvaine,	May 2, 1865,	Warren, Ohio.
Christ,	Coxe,	Apr. 29,	" Oswego, W. New York.
Emmanuel,	Kemper,	May 9,	" Lancaster, Wisconsin.
Incarnation,	Potter, H.	Apr. 20,	" New York City, N. Y.
St. James,	McCoskry,	Apr. 19,	" Albion, Mich.
St. John's,	Odenheimer,	Mar. 26,	" Elizabeth, New Jersey.
St. John's,	Whitehouse,	Apr. 24,	" Naperville, Ill.
St. Luke's,	Coxe,	May 20,	" Jamestown, W. N. Y.
St. Matthew's,	Eastburn,	May 11,	" South Boston, Mass.
St. Paul's,	Coxe,	May 18,	" Mayville, W. N. Y.
St. Paul's,	Coxe,	May 4,	" Waterloo, W. N. Y.
St. Peter's,	Potter, H.	Apr. 23,	" Brooklyn, N. Y.
St. Phillip's,	Coxe,	May 31,	" Belmont, W. N. Y.
Trinity,	Kemper,	Mar. 5,	" Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

## OBITUARIES.

The Rt. Rev. WILLIAM HEATHCOTE DE LANCEY, D. D., LL. D., D. C. L., Bishop of the Diocese of Western New York, died at Geneva, April 5th, 1865, aged nearly sixty-seven and a half years. He was born at Mamaroneck, N. Y., Oct. 8th, 1797, a descendant of Chief Justice De Lancey; graduated at Yale College, with distinction, in 1817; was ordained Deacon in St. John's Chapel, N. Y., on the Feast of the Holy Innocents, A. D., 1819. His first ministerial labor was given to Grace Church, N. Y., of which he was in charge, during the vacancy of the Rectorship, which preceded that of the Rev. Dr. Wainwright. He then officiated for a short time in the newly organized Parish of St. Thomas', Mamaroneck, which had been formed out of the ancient Parish of Rye, in the immediate vicinity of the home of his ancestors. He having been advanced to the Priesthood on the 6th of March, A. D., 1822, in Trinity Church, N. Y., he removed to the City of Philadelphia, where he became an Assistant Minister of the united Churches of Christ Church, St. Peter's, and St. James', of which the venerable Bishop White was then the Rector. He remained in Philadelphia throughout his Presbyterate of seventeen years—succeeding to the Rectorship of St. Peter's, and filling, for a time, the office of Provost of the University of Pennsylvania—until his return to his native State as first Bishop of the new Diocese of Western New York; to which office he was consecrated on the Feast of the Ascension of our Blessed Lord, A. D., 1839.

The Funeral Services were held in Trinity Church, Geneva, April 11th. The sentences were read by the Rev Dr. Bissell; the portion

of the 39th Psalm was chanted by the choir; the portion of the 90th was read by the Rev. Dr. Metcalf; the Lesson by the Rev. Dr. Ingersoll; the 13th selection of Psalms in metre was announced by the Rev. Dr. Hull; the address was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Van Ingen; the 6th, 7th and 8th verses of the 34th selection were then given out by the Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer, and sung to the Old Hundredth; the opening part of the Burial Service was then read by the Rev. Dr. Jackson, the committal by the Rev. Dr. Bissell, the sentence, "I heard a voice," was sung by the choir, and the Lord's Prayer and concluding Collects said by the Rev. Dr. Bolles, of Boston. His remains rest in the family burial-place at Mamaroneck.

We hope hereafter to present a sketch of the life, labors and character of this accomplished, devoted, and successful Bishop. The history of his Episcopate, in such a field as Western New York, would afford a valuable study.

The Rev. CHARLES JONES died in the City of New York, Oct. 28, 1864. Mr. Jones was an Englishman by birth and education, and was a Dissenting Minister, before coming to this country. He was the founder, or one of the earliest Ministers of Calvary Church, New York City; he was Rector of St. John's Church, Tuckahoe, New York; and of Trinity Church, Marshall, Michigan. For several years he has been incapacitated, by physical infirmities, for active service, yet has rendered frequent assistance to his brethren. He was a scholarly man, of refinement of feeling and manners, and a well-read and sound divine. He was buried from St. Stephen's Church, New York City, Oct. 31, 1864.

The Rev. EDWARD C. JONES died at Philadelphia, March 2, 1865. He was born in Philadelphia; graduated at the University of Pennsylvania; officiated as Assistant to Rev. Dr. Boyd, of St. John's Church, Philadelphia, and at Georgetown, D. C., and Pottstown, Penn.; and at the time of his death, was Chaplain at the Blockley Almshouse, in Philadelphia, which post he has filled for fifteen or sixteen years.

The Rev. BASSETT TREVETT, D. D., Rector of St. James' Church, North Salem, N. J., died at that place, March 8th. He was a native of New York; was brought up a Congregationalist; was ordained by Bishop B. T. Onderdonk, in 1841; in 1843, became Professor of Languages in St. James' College, Maryland; in 1855, was Professor of Languages in St. John's College, Annapolis.

The Rev. EVAN M. JOHNSON, D. D., Rector of St. Michael's Parish, Brooklyn, New York, died at Brooklyn, March 19th, aged 73 years. He was born at Newport, R. I., June, 1792; was ordained in Trinity Church, Newport, July 8, 1813, by Bishop Griswold; became assistant Rector of Grace Church, New York City, in 1814; Rector of St. James' Church, Newtown, L. I., in 1815; in 1824 he built St. John's Church, Brooklyn; in 1847 he founded St. Michael's Parish, and remained Rector until his death.

The Rev. CHARLES DRESSER, D. D., died in Springfield, Illinois, March 25, 1865, aged 66 years.

The Rev. JAMES WELLESLEY JONES, Rector of St. Luke's Church, Altoona, Penn., died at Altoona, April 15, 1865, aged 32 years. He was born at Helston, England, Sept. 16, 1832; graduated at Bishops College, Canada East; was ordained Deacon by the Bishop of Quebec in 1858, and Priest in 1859. In 1859 he was assistant to Rev. Dr. Howe, in Philadelphia; was Chaplain of the Seamen's Mission, in Philadelphia, and was in charge of St. Luke's Parish, Altoona, about fifteen months.

The Rev. WILLIAM CREIGHTON, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Tarrytown, N. Y., died at Tarrytown, April 23, 1865, aged 73 years. He was born in the City of New York, Feb. 22d, 1793. His ancestors were all of the Church, and many of them are reposing in the Burial ground of Old Trinity;—William Bradford, being an ancestor on the maternal side. Dr. Creighton was educated in Columbia College, graduating in the Class of 1812, and received his Doctor's Degree, in 1830, from the same Institution, of which also he was a Trustee, from 1828 to 1840. He was ordained Deacon by Bishop Hobart, in the early part of 1815; the Rev. Dr. Brown, of Newburgh, receiving Orders at the same time. Soon after, he was employed in Grace Church, New York, as an assistant to the Rev. Dr. Bowen. In 1816, he was called to the Rectorship of St. Mark's Church-in-the-Bowery, of which he remained Rector until 1836; when he removed to the residence purchased by him on the Banks of the Hudson, where he continued to reside till his death. In 1836, he became Rector of Zion Church, Greenburgh, and resigned the same in 1845. In the same year, (1836,) the Parish of Christ Church, Tarrytown, was organized, of which he was chosen Rector, and remained so up to the time of his death, a period of 29 years, without salary. In 1845 he was elected President of the Convention of the Diocese of New York, and was re-elected every succeeding year until the Consecration of the Rev. Dr. Wainwright, in 1852. At the first election of a Provisional Bishop of New York, he was chosen to that high Office, but, from various considerations, declined its acceptance. He was also chosen President of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, of the General Conventions of 1853, 1856, and 1859, respectively. He had previously served the Church in different stations of trust, as member of the Standing Committee—Chairman of the Missionary Committee, &c. In 1849–50, the Church of St. Mary's, Beechwood, was founded by him and his son-in-law, the Rev. EDWARD N. MEAD, D. D.; the principal part of the cost for the erection and ground being contributed by them, and Divine Service being maintained by them in it, as a Free Church, to the present time.

The Rev. JOHN S. DEWEY died in Branford, Conn., April 27, 1865, aged 42 years. He was born at Litchfield, Conn., Nov. 13, 1822; was, by profession, a Clerk and Book-keeper; was ordained Deacon,

in Trinity Church, New Haven, Nov. 4, 1855, by Bishop Williams; and Priest, by the same Bishop, in St. Thomas' Church, New Haven, April 12, 1857. With the exception of a few months at Central Village, Conn., he had never any pastoral charge, though he officiated, occasionally, as he had opportunity. He resumed his profession of book-keeping.

The Rev. JOHN A. VAUGHAN, D. D., Professor in the Divinity School at Philadelphia, Penn., died at Philadelphia, June 5th, 1865.

#### CONVERSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

Rev. FRANCIS LOBDELL, formerly a Congregational Minister in Bridgeport, Conn., has renounced Congregationalism, and become a Candidate for Holy Orders in the Church.

Mr. JOHN K. KARCHER, lately a Unitarian Minister in Mass., has applied to become a Candidate for Holy Orders in the Church.

Mr. DAVID BISHOP, lately a Baptist Minister, has applied to be received as Candidate for Orders in Connecticut.

Rev. Mr. FISKE, recently ordained Deacon by Bishop H. Potter, was formerly a Unitarian.

Rev. Mr. DUERR, lately ordained Deacon in Ohio, was formerly a German Lutheran Minister.

Mr. JOHN SCOTT, lately a Baptist Minister in Minnesota, has applied to become a Candidate for Orders in that Diocese.

Mr. THOMAS MARSDEN, formerly a Methodist Minister, has become a Candidate for Orders in New York.

Mr. JACOB MILLER, formerly a Methodist Minister, has become a Candidate for Orders in Western New York.

Mr. HENRY BROOKE, lately ordained Deacon in Baltimore, Md., was formerly a Methodist preacher.

Rev. WILLIAM LUSK, lately ordained Deacon, by Bishop Kemper, was formerly a Presbyterian Minister.

Rev. RAFAEL DIAZ MARTINEZ, late a Priest of the Romish Church in Mexico, formally recanted the errors of that Church on Sunday morning, May 21st, covenanting to conform to the doctrine and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church. He is, therefore, now a Minister of this Church. The ceremony took place in the Church of the Ascension. This is the third case of the kind which has recently taken place.

Mr. DEWITT C. HOWARD, formerly a Methodist preacher, has been recommended a Candidate for Orders in the Diocese of Illinois.

## CONNECTICUT.

At the last Annual Convention, at New Haven, June 13th and 14th, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Williams, in his Address, brought forward the subject of the division of that Diocese. His words were uttered with great solemnity and feeling. He recommended such a division, simply because of the utter impossibility of any one Bishop to do the work which the Diocese demands. The subject was referred to a Committee of nine, who are to report at a future Convention. That such a prelate as Bishop Williams, universally loved and admired in his diocese, still in the vigor of manhood, fond of work, full of life and zeal, deeply learned, and thoroughly familiar with the practical working of the Church in primitive times, himself, too, a successor of the noble Seabury, who gave the Primitive Ministry to the New World,—we say, that such a proposition, under such circumstances, marks a new era in the history of the American Church. If Connecticut, one of the smallest of the States, threaded all over with Railroads, and so easily accessible at all points, demands more Bishops, what shall be said of New York, and Pennsylvania, and Maryland, and Virginia, and Ohio, and Illinois, and Kentucky; not to name the other great Dioceses of the West and of the South. Thank God, the age of Mediæval Feudalism and Hanoverianism, and of Romish consolidation, is drawing to a close. What we want is, the simple machinery of Apostolic times. This we shall have, sooner or later. And then, we shall only want Apostolic life and love.

On the opening of the Convention, an effort was made, by motion, to admit a German Moravian Minister to a seat in the Convention, and so to recognize the validity of Moravian Orders. The motion was promptly met with opposition, and was withdrawn before a vote was taken.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

The Diocesan Convention, at its last Session, took some important steps in the right direction towards true progress. The Rev. Dr. Leeds made a Report, and offered certain Resolutions on the Ministration of Christian Women in the Church. Also, a Committee was appointed to Report on the practicability of restoring the office of Evangelist in the Missionary work of the Diocese. The most important business of the Convention was that of the division of the Diocese. Mr. William Welsh offered the following:

*Resolved*, That this Convention hereby consents to the formation of a new Diocese in the Western portion of the State, having for its Eastern boundary, the Eastern line of McKean, Cameron, Clearfield, Cambria and Somerset counties, and, with the consent of the Bishop, this action will be communicated to the General Convention.

*Resolved*, That under existing circumstances, this Convention considers that a sum of not less than \$30,000 should be safely invested for the support of the Episcopate, before the consent of the Bishop of this Diocese is asked for.



Every effort which ingenuity could devise, was made to defeat the plan; and although the claims of the project were made to rest on sheer necessity, rather than on sound principle, the Resolutions were adopted by a clerical vote of 100 to 42, and by a lay vote of 58 to 18. Resolutions were also adopted, recognizing an organic relation between the new Diocese and the old, and requesting the Deputies to the General Convention to secure that end by requisite legislation. So Pennsylvania is the first of all our Dioceses to get back, (or forward,) one step, towards the Primitive order of things. We refer the reader, in this connection, to the Article in the present No. on "Provinces." It is from the pen of one of the most learned of our Bishops.

#### KENTUCKY.

At the Diocesan Convention held in Louisville, May 24, the Rt. Rev. the Bishop, in his Address, said :—"By my visit, two years in succession, to one or two parishes in the Diocese of Tennessee, vacant by the death of the lamented Bishop Otey, my attention has naturally been called to questions arising out of the absence of certain Bishops and Clerical and Lay deputies, from the last General Convention. Without any wish to influence the opinion of our deputies about to be elected, I hope I may be permitted, without offense, to express the hope *that all may be received back again with open arms, and with as perfect an oblivion of the past as the most sanctified natures of Christian men can attain unto, and with as full a recognition of the unity of the Church as ever before.*"

That part of the Bishop's Address which related to the Southern Bishops and Clergy, was referred to a select committee of five. After mature deliberation, the Committee reported the following Resolutions, which were adopted without a dissenting voice :—

*Resolved*, That the sentiments expressed in the foregoing extracts from the Bishop's Address, are, especially in the present crisis of the Church and the country, a very noble illustration of the true spirit of the Gospel of Christ, eminently worthy of a Bishop in the Church of God, and have the cordial approval of this Convention.

*Resolved*, That this Convention disapproves of uncharitable sermons, addresses, and Church newspaper articles, against the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the South, as tending greatly to impair, if not to defeat, the truly Christian policy enunciated in the Bishop's Address.

As the subject of the relations between the Church, North and South, will, of necessity, be considered in the next General Convention, it will help us to understand the tone and position of the Southern Clergy and Laity, by referring to the Pastoral Letter of their Bishops, issued from Augusta, November 22, 1862. They declare that they were "forced, by the Providence of God, to separate themselves from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, a Church with *whose doctrine, discipline and worship, WE WERE IN ENTIRE HARMONY, AND WITH WHOSE ACTION, UP TO THE TIME OF THAT SEPARATION, WE WERE ABUNDANTLY SATISFIED.*"

We venture to hope that, at the Convention, crimination and re-crimination, and a war of angry words and bitter passion, may not hopelessly and forever sunder brethren who are one in Faith, and may be one in affection and mutual confidence, and in efficient action in the cause of Christ and His Church. The enemies of the Church will spare no efforts to prevent the consummation of such a blessed union. They are already at work, openly and covertly.

#### THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN VIRGINIA.

The following Circular, from Bishop Johns, of Virginia, was recently read in the Churches in Richmond.

*To the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Virginia:*—"The issue of the painful conflict through which we have passed, and which leaves the Commonwealth under the jurisdiction of the United States, renders very clear the course proper for us to pursue. Obedience to 'the powers that be,' for conscience sake, is the duty of all who profess and call themselves Christians; and as such, are also enjoined to make prayer and supplication for their rulers,—it is incumbent upon them to implore the blessing of Almighty God on those in authority over them. For this purpose, the form to which we had long been accustomed, is, for obvious reasons, most advisable. Therefore, I do not hesitate to recommend its use, in public worship, by the good people of this Diocese, and to express the hope that they will be true and faithful to its spirit, in all their action and intercourse with their fellow-citizens, that the resumed civil relations may be happily maintained and redound to the glory of God and the temporal and spiritual welfare of the nation.

J. JOHNS,

"Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church  
in the Diocese of Virginia."

The annual meeting of the Diocese and Council is deferred, in consequence of the breaking up of Railroad communication.

#### BISHOP GREGG'S PASTORAL LETTER.

To the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Texas:—

DEAR BRETHREN:—The termination of the war, and the changes which have followed it, render it proper, in accordance with the teachings of Scripture, and the practice of the Church, that there should be a return to the Liturgy as it was before our late government was established. Omitting, therefore, as already requested, the "Special Prayers," which have been for some time past in use, you will, in the Prayer for "all in civil authority," insert the words, "the President of the United States;" and also in that for the Congress, whenever it may be in session, say, "as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled."

May I beg, also, that you will enforce, as far as possible, upon the people of your charge, the general feeling and course of conduct recommended in my late Pastoral, as most necessary to be cherished and observed under the circumstances which now surround us. The importance of such duties cannot be over-estimated, at a time like the present, nor should any proper means, under it, be left untried for promoting the peace, order, and quiet, with the blessings of well-established rule, and spiritual prosperity, above all, which we now so ardently desire. A great work will open rapidly before us. Let it be well considered and faithfully discharged, as it comes by the help of Him whose grace is sufficient for us, and the results, as far as our influence may extend, will be happy for the country and for the Church—praying, as we will ever do, that the one may be greatly blessed of God in every element of virtuous progress, and the course of this world so peaceably ordered by His governance, that the other may joyfully serve Him in all godly quietness, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Affectionately yours, in Christ,

ALEX. GREGG, Bishop of Texas.

NATIONAL UNITARIAN CONVENTION.—CHANGE OF BASE.

This meeting, previously called, was held in New York, April 5th and 6th. Its avowed object was, to unite the Unitarians of the country in one organization: and the present was deemed, by its leaders, a most auspicious time for such a movement. The Convention certainly wrought some results not specified in the "Call." It proved, that that Denomination cannot, by any possibility, come together on the basis of any common belief. It also shocked and startled the whole community, by the grossness of impiety and blasphemy, of which some of the speakers were guilty. Such things are regarded as a matter of course in Boston; here, people shuddered with horror. In this Convention, the radical and conservative wings of the Unitarian denomination were fully represented. There were delegates present from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, and the Canadas. The following were unanimously elected officers of the Convention:—

*President*—Governor Andrew.

*Vice Presidents*—Hon. T. D. Elliot, Hon. J. J. Palfrey, Judge E. R. Hoar, W. W. Culver, Wm. Ichabod Goodwin, W. C. Bryant, Esq., Rev. Dr. Orville Dewey, Rev. Mr. Galvia, Rev. Mr. Hosmer, and A. A. Low, Esq.

The Rev. J. F. Clarke, of Boston, preached the Sermon; which was the key-note to the Convention. He thought the time had come for "a change of base;" and to re-construct Christianity on a platform suited to the times. As Paul and Barnabas cut loose from old Judaism, and established Religion on a new basis, so there is a like necessity now. And as these Unitarian leaders claim to be just as really inspired as the Apostles were, of course, they are the men to

re-construct Christianity on the right basis. What this new basis is to be, neither Mr. Clarke nor the other speakers at the Convention seemed quite able to tell us. But, in one thing they were fully agreed; that there shall be no Creed, nothing to be believed, in the "New Christianity." Their scheme reminds us of a new definition of Religion, which appeared some time ago. It was when the famous Fanny Essler was turning the heads of all the cockneys with her marvellous *pirouettes*. On one occasion, an adorer, overcome by an extraordinary gyration, exclaimed, in the ardor of his devotion; "This is poetry—this is religion." The late Mrs. Browning, said; "modern thought in matters religious was developing two great classes of thinkers; those who tolerated everybody, because they believed nothing; and those who tolerated nobody, because they believed something."

In the Convention, a Mr. Low read a long preamble, affirming the necessity of agreement in certain doctrinal statements, in order to secure associate and efficient action; and offered, as such Doctrinal Basis, the following:—

1st. Belief in the Holy Scriptures, as containing a revelation from God to man, and, as deduced therefrom.

2d. Belief in one God, the Father.

3d. Belief in one Lord, Jesus Christ, our Saviour; the Son of God, and His specially appointed Messenger and Representative to our race; gifted with supernatural power, "approved of God by miracles, and signs and wonders, which God did by Him," and thus, by Divine authority, commanding the devout and reverential faith of all who claim the Christian name.

4th. Belief in the Holy Ghost, the Comforter.

5th. Belief in the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection from the dead, and life everlasting. The Convention, however, promptly laid all this upon the table.

A Committee on the general subject subsequently reported, that any doctrinal views which might be brought forward in the Convention, or be approved by a majority, should not be obligatory on those who might choose to dissent from them, and that the largest exercise and development of a liberal faith, on the basis of Christianity, should mark the action and deliberation of the Committee. A Preamble and Resolutions, of which the following is the substance, were then read:—

*Whereas*, The great opportunities and demands for Christian labor and consecration at this time, increase our sense of the obligation of all disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, to prove their faith by self-denial, and by the devotion of their lives and possessions to the service of God, and the building up of the kingdom of His Son;

Therefore, the Christian churches of the Unitarian Faith here assembled, unite themselves in a common body, to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian Churches, to the end of energizing and stimulating the Denomination with which they are connected, to the largest exertions in the cause of Christian faith and work.

The debate which followed, beggars description. In the course of debate, Rev. Dr. Bellows, of this city, the originator of the movement, and its leading spirit, announced the only proposition in which the Convention was so unanimous that no one questioned it. He said:—

"We ought to labor for the elevation of the heathen around us with as much zeal as if we thought they are in danger of going to hell—which, blessed be God, *we do not believe!*"

Mr. Town said he considered Mr. Clark had made a rare spiritual mistake in his remarks. There were in that Convention men of every opinion, waiting to come in, and they should open their doors to them. Let the Universalists, the Independents, let the Spiritualists, let all believers come into their body, and unite with them. He believed the title Lord Jesus Christ was not the title which they should acknowledge, for he was the servant of God.

Rev. Mr. Burleigh, a regularly accredited delegate from Florence, Mass., said he should like to see a house of refuge for the whole liberal faith of the country, even though it should not be called Unitarian. He should favor a system by which they could all unite together, and act as Jesus Christ had acted to benefit the world. Some had called Christ "Lord," *but he believed they were wrong. He should be in favor of calling him Master Jesus Christ, or Mr. Jesus Christ, in order to explain his character.*

Rev. Mr. Watson, of Connecticut, said, for one, he could not call Jesus Christ "Lord." He could not accept the word Lord in that connection. Jesus Christ came to benefit the race; but place him over the head of any man, and he would object to it; Christ did not come to be a Lord over them, He came to emancipate mankind, and he (the speaker) did not want any one to be a Lord between himself and God.

The aspect of this Convention, as it appeared to a looker-on, was as remarkable as its doings. We are tempted to sketch pen-and-ink portraits of at least three distinct and strongly marked types of physiognomy, as represented in the Convention,—each, of course, gradually shading off into the others. But the entire absence of that seriousness, dignity, and reverence, which became a body of men, met to discuss matters of infinite moment, was specially noticeable. Again and again, the debates of this Convention, and the tone of the speakers, recalled to mind the *Tiers Etat* of 1789. We see here the cropping out of that Materialistic School which Herbert Spencer and his followers are trying to found among us. It is not Christianity alone which is at stake. Give to such a body of men and women the requisite influence and power, and a leader like Mirabeau, and the horrible scenes of 1792, and a Robespierre, will not long be wanting. In this Convention, the Boston element, of course, was predominant. It ought to be added, that this Convention, instead of beginning or ending their Session with the Holy Sacrament, terminated their strange doings with an oyster supper at a Music Saloon.

It is proper to say, that not a few of the leading men of the Convention, such as the Rev. Dr. Osgood, of New York, evidently not only had no sympathy with the ribald blasphemy which was poured

forth, but saw at a glance the inevitable effect of such horrible language upon the community, and shrunk from it with that disgust which becomes a Christian and a gentleman. And yet, they are to be held responsible for all this, so long as they are in "ecclesiastical" fellowship with its abettors and advocates. In consequence of such opposition, we find the following subsequent action, on the part of the above named Mr. Burleigh, which is worth preserving.

"Mr. Burleigh, and his free Congregational society at Florence, Northampton, have passed the following Resolutions concerning the late National Unitarian Conference in New York:—

"*Resolved*, That the dishonorable, arrogant, and unchristian conduct of certain members of the late Unitarian Convention, exhibited in low blackguardism towards the delegates which this society had sent, pursuant to the invitation extended to it in the call for said Convention, and, after the Committee on credentials had duly admitted said Delegates to seats in the Convention, shows how difficult it is for a man to be a priest, and have, at the same time, a tolerant, enlarged, and magnanimous soul.

"*Resolved*, That we see in the priestly arrogance and intolerance of the majority of the Convention towards that class of persons who have concluded to do their own thinking, another evidence of the tendency of a hierarchy to stand, as it has stood in all ages, an obstacle in the path of human progress.

"*Resolved*, That the action of said Convention tends to confirm the wisdom and necessity of such organizations as the Free Congregational Society of Florence, which combines the advantages of associate effort, without ecclesiastical trammels, and a platform without a creed, for the utterance of human thought without a fetter."

#### VALIDITY OR INVALIDITY OF NON-EPISCOPAL ORDERS.

In preserving, in our department of Domestic Intelligence, a record of important movements touching the Church, we had prepared a full statement of recent acts of gross irregularity and violations of Rubrics and Canons, on the part of a few of our Clergy, holding important positions in this city and Diocese. We had also indicated certain results which were sure to follow a repetition of such acts. The publication of the Pastoral on the subject, by the Rt. Reverend, the Bishop of New York, however, leads us to withhold, for the present, the statement prepared, and to reserve comment for a future occasion.

#### ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

On the evening of Good Friday, April 14th, ABRAHAM LINCOLN, President of the United States, was shot by an assassin, at about half-past nine o'clock. He lingered, apparently unconscious and insensible, until twenty-two minutes after seven o'clock, on the morning of the next day, when he died. An attempt was made, at about the same hour, to take the life of the Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD, Secretary of State, by stabbing, which, happily, was frustrated. The names of these



conspirators and assassins we will not give. Let them sink into oblivion; the infamy of their dastardly deeds will live forever. The President, at the hour of his death, had a large place in the hearts and confidence of the American people, which he had won, not more by his personal virtues, than by the new attitude of Peace-Maker, to which the events of the last few months had elevated him. The pen of the historian will do justice to his life and memory. The outward, visible manifestations of sorrow and mourning throughout the country at his death were universal. In this great City, whose population is peculiarly susceptible to impression, the scene was one never to be forgotten. The Funeral Services were performed at the Capitol, on Wednesday, April 19th, and the remains were conveyed from Washington to Springfield, Ill., by way of Baltimore, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, New York, Albany, Buffalo, Cleaveland, Columbus, Indianapolis, and Chicago, attended everywhere with the most signal demonstrations of national grief and sense of bereavement.

The self-control everywhere apparent among the people during these days of intense excitement, the absence of tumult and violence, and, above all, the deep religious sensibility, as witnessed in the houses of Worship, every where thronged to overflowing, are specially noteworthy. They give assurance of the strength and permanence of our National Institutions. Men may die; the Government lives; and is more stable, to day, from the terrible baptism of blood through which it has recently passed.

CONNECTICUT. TRINITY COLLEGE.—The Faculty of the College state that during the past year, to their endowments already, \$100,000 have been added. Of this sum, \$96,000 were contributed in the State of Connecticut; \$55,000 were given by citizens of Hartford; members of the Board of Trustees contributed \$38,000. In addition to the above, the munificent bequest of \$20,000, by the Rev. N. S. Wheaton, D. D., has become available. In accordance with the terms of the will, \$10,000 are set apart for the building of a Chapel. Several additions are already made to this Fund. A member of the Class of '53 has laid the foundation of an Astronomical Observatory Fund by the generous gift of \$2500. "The Alumni Library Fund" has been increased so as to make the aggregate of the Library Funds, \$20,000.

PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,—NEW SCHOOL.

This division of the Presbyterian Body held a long session, during the month of May, in Brooklyn, New York. The Old School body held its Sessions in Pittsburgh. The debates in both bodies, especially on political subjects, the spirit of violence, the bad temper, the bitter denunciations, the pharisaical self-conceit exhibited, may well teach Churchmen wisdom, in view of our own approaching General Convention. A very strange illustration of the utter want of fixed principle and definite views on the most important subjects, occurred in the New School Assembly at Brooklyn. There had been presented to this Assembly "an Overture from the Synod of Albany, as to the act



by which members are admitted to the church." It was apparent, in the discussion, that no body seemed to know, exactly, when a person does become a "member of the Presbyterian Church." Dr. Adams thought that a baptized child had some relation to the Church, but what that is, he did not seem to know; certainly he did not try to tell. Some thought the private examination before the Session, and the vote of the Session, gives membership. Some thought necessary a public assent to the Articles of Faith and Covenant on "the Sacramental Sabbath." One gentleman, a layman, "Hon. Henry W. Williams, of the Presbytery of Pittsburgh, cited the Confession of Faith, to show that the visible Church consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and that baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace," &c. This, although the language of the Presbyterian Standards themselves, seemed to produce little impression upon the Assembly; and that body finally decided, by a considerable majority, that the vote of the Session "is the essential and final act," by which admission to the "Presbyterian Church" is effected.

**LITURGICAL TENDENCIES.**—The pastor of a large Presbyterian Congregation in Newark, N. J., has invited the Rector of Trinity Church to preach for him on some Sunday evening, that may be convenient, and to use, on the occasion, the service prescribed in the Prayer Book. It is said that this Clergyman is preparing a Liturgy for the use of his own Congregation, compiled mainly from the Book of Common Prayer.

The following item appears in the *Intelligencer*:—

"Dr. Storrs' [Congregational] Church, Brooklyn, has had a second vote on the Liturgy question, and by 58 to 12 have decided in favor of joining, orally, in the Lord's Prayer, and of responsive recitations of Psalms, to be selected and arranged by the Pastor for that purpose."

#### NATIONAL ACADEMY OF DESIGN.

The new building, recently erected for the Academy, was formally opened, April 27th, with appropriate ceremonies. Mr. Huntington, President of the Academy, delivered an appropriate Address, and Mr. Bryant, the Poet, also a Discourse, full of beauty. His allusions to Cole, Inman, Ingham, Morse and Durand, and other American artists, were very graceful. Of the building itself, and of several of the pictures which adorn its walls, we hope to present a criticism in a future Number, and to offer some thoughts on American Art, the patronage of which is far in advance of any true conception, or correct popular taste.

**ORDER OF ST. BENEDICT.**—Under the head of Foreign Intelligence, we had prepared an account of the puerilities and superstitions of which this new Order of Monks are guilty. English authorities

give reason to believe that they hold to the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Romish sense, or that there is, in the Holy Sacrament, a repetition or continuation of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

We learn that the Third Order of St. Benedict has been introduced into the American Church. Radical departures from the principles of the Church are already apparent in both directions, and threaten open rupture from the Church, sooner or later.

#### SANDWICH ISLANDS.

The Rev. George B. Whipple, brother of the Bishop of Minnesota, has received an appointment as Missionary to the Sandwich Islands, from the Bishop of Honolulu, and contemplated leaving the Diocese for his new home soon after Easter. Rev. Mr. Whipple resided, for some time, in the Sandwich Islands, and is familiar with the language and customs of the people, and will be well qualified for Missionary work.♦

#### MAY ANNIVERSARIES.

The condition of several of the Societies, whose Anniversaries were held in New York in May, is as follows:—

THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.—Receipts for the year, \$667,851. 36, of which \$404,722 16, was from the sale of books; \$256,750 66 from donations, collections, and legacies, and \$16,378 51, from rents. Number of books printed here, 1,432,655; in foreign lands, 287,904; total, 1,720,569. Aggregate issues of the last four years, 5,304,703 volumes. Total number of volumes issued since the organization of the Society, 20,609,564.

AMERICAN HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—The receipts of the Society have been \$186,897 50; expenditures, \$180,965 39—leaving \$7,750 46, still due to Missionaries for labor performed. The total receipts are less than in the preceding year, by \$8,640 49; but the diminution has been occasioned by the smaller amount received from legacies.

THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, (New York). The receipts of the year have been as follows:—Donations and legacies, \$136,027 73. Cash sales, \$295,338 24—total, \$421,365 97; exceeding the income of any previous year.

AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.—The proper anniversary of the Board is held in September. A public meeting in its behalf was, according to custom, held May 12th. It has in active operation 22 Missions, with 111 stations, and 213 out-stations, distributed over almost all the unevangelized portion of the globe—one-third of its Missionaries, and more than one-third of its expenditure being, however, employed in the Turkish Empire. The out-stations are manned entirely by a native agency. The number of ordained Missionaries from this country is 150; other laborers from

this country, 178; ordained native pastors, 41; unordained native preachers and catechists, 251; laborers of all classes, 1,068.

**AMERICAN COLONIZATION SOCIETY.**—As one of the fruits of the War, the number of emigrants sent out by the American Colonization Society is considerably diminished during the last year, there having been but twenty-three sent to Liberia. The Treasury shows diminished receipts, which that year were \$91,454 74, while the expenditures were \$89,931 45. Thirty-five thousand dollars have been invested in United States securities.

Appropriations have been made for enriching Liberia with the facilities of civilization and education. Machinery for the marketable preparation of sugar has been ordered; about forty beasts of burden and draught have been introduced from the Cape de Verde Islands; a statistical return of the condition of the Republic has been arranged for, and \$2,500 applied to the support of Liberia College.

**IMMIGRATION AT THE PORT OF NEW YORK.**—From the Annual Report of the Commissioners of Emigration, it appears that the whole number of passengers landed at this port during the year 1864, was 222,338. These figures show an increase in the alien emigration last year, over 1863, of 27,072; the increase over 1862, was 106,610; over 1861, 117,387; over 1860, 77,754; over 1859, 103,594; over 1858, 104,327; but the alien emigration was 857 less than in 1857. The comparison of the figures last year with the results of former years since 1847, shows that the increase was 8,182.

The nationality of the 182,916 emigrants is as follows:—Ireland, 89,706; Germany, 57,572; England, 23,871; other countries, 11,761;

Of the 184,000 persons who landed at Castle Garden, 92,000 reported their intended destination to be the State of New York; 23,500 were going to Pennsylvania and New Jersey; 21,000 to New England; 34,000 to Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota and California; 4,900 to Kansas, Nebraska, Canada, &c., and 8,000 to the Southern and border States.

---

**NOTE.**—A large amount of Domestic and Foreign Intelligence is crowded out. With the return to lower prices of paper and work, the size of the Review will be enlarged, to meet such emergencies.

## EDITORIAL.

The addition of a large number of subscribers to our list within the last few months, induces us to say a few words to them on the character and objects of the *AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW*.

*First:* It is a Church Review; devoted, directly and mainly to the interests of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States; to the elucidation and defense of her principles; to the awakening of a truer appreciation of her duties and opportunities; and a more earnest coöperation in her great work. Certain marked features of the Scriptural and Primitive age we shall do what we can to restore to our own Branch of the Church. They are functional, not organic or constitutional. They are such as Smaller Dioceses; a more fitting adjustment of the relative duties of the three-fold Ministry; a freer life and fuller development in the practical working of the Church on the part of the Laity; with, at the same time, a firm adherence to all that is truly Catholic, in Faith, Order, Discipline and Worship. Our leading aim in the Review, is, to make intelligent, earnest, thorough, American Churchmen.

*Second:* It is no part of the object of this Review to cater for the mere amusement of its readers. Those who insist on so much diverting and pleasant reading in return for so much money, will find what they want—Novels, love stories, and pictorial literature—in abundance elsewhere.

*Third:* The general scope of the Review is comprehensive; embracing a wide field, comprising everything pertaining to Literature, Art, and Science; and intelligent and thoughtful readers may confidently look in the Review for discussions of interest and importance.

*Fourth:* With the great diversity of tastes among our readers, we shall aim at diversity of character in the selection of Articles published. The Review is not for the Clergy alone, nor for laymen alone, nor for professional gentlemen alone, of any sort. It is intended, that each shall find, in every Number of the Review, something of special interest; and that the Review, as a whole, shall be acceptable to all.

*Fifth:* The names of the writers we cannot publish with the Articles themselves. Our best writers, on certain subjects, write more freely and effectively when their own personality is lost, for the time being, in that of the Review. A complete list of the writers of the several Articles will, however, be published hereafter, for the use of subscribers. The name of the author of each Article, in the first eight Volumes, has already been printed; and a similar list, comprising the last eight Volumes, will appear in due time. In proof that the Review has the best talent in the Church in its pages, we will state that the following writers have contributed to the last two Volumes, and the Volume now in course of publication.

The Rt. Rev. Bishops COXE, SOUTHGATE and WILLIAMS, the Rev. DRS. ADAMS of Wisconsin, ALLEN of Maryland, BUELL of New York, CRAIK of Kentucky, COIT of New York, DOD of New Jersey, HALL of Washington City, HALLAM of Conn.

LEWIS of Conn., LITTLEJOHN of New York, MAHAN of Maryland, McVICKAR of New York, REYNOLDS of Ill., SHELTON of Vt., WILSON of W. N. Y.; the Rev. Messrs. BOGGS of N. Y., DOANE of Conn., HOMER of N. Y., HOPKINS of N. Y., LANGDON of Maryland, MORRIS of Penn., OLSSEN of N. Y., PERRY of Conn., RANKIN of Md., RICHEY of N. Y., WARD of Conn., YOUNG of New York, J. D. DANA, LL. D., of Conn., H. A. DUBOIS, LL. D., of Conn., Prof. FERGUSON of Washington City, Mrs. LINCOLN PHELPS of Md., WILLIAM WELSH of Penn., besides Articles of the Editor. Some of these are pledged to regular contributions hereafter, and the aid of other able pens is promised.

With the return of lower prices, the size of the Review will be enlarged, and its value in several respects increased.

With this plain understanding between ourselves and our subscribers, we do not hesitate to ask for their kind sympathy, and their constant and cordial coöperation. Never, in the history of the American Church, was the need of an able, manly, independent Review as great as it is now, and will be for some years to come. Radicalism was never so rampant; self-will never so daring; Infidelity never so insidious and defiant. The Church needs upon her citadels true-hearted men, men of faith, men of courage, men of wisdom. With the experience of seventeen years of ceaseless labor, we should have been dull scholars not to have learned something in such a school; and we feel strong in the coöperation of those gentlemen who sympathize so thoroughly in the aims of the Review; to whose pens its readers have been, and will be, so largely indebted, and whose valuable labors we here most gratefully acknowledge.

N. S. RICHARDSON, D. D.,  
*Editor and Proprietor.*

New York, 31 Bible House.  
July 1st, 1865.